YOUNG INDIA

BY

MAHATMA GANDHI

VOL. II

S. GANESAN,
PUBLISHER, TRIPLICANE, MADRAS, S. E.

THE TRIAL OF MAHATMA GANDHI

PRINTED AT
THE HUXLEY PRESS, 27, LINGHA CHETTY STREET, MADRAS
1922

In the Ahmedabad Sessions Court

BEFORE

C. N. BROOMRFIELD ESQ., I.C.S.

District and Sessions Judge

18th March 1922

REX. *vs.* M. K. GANDHI AND S. G. BANKER

The trial of Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Sankarlal Banker opened at the Government Circuit House, Ahmedabad, at 12 noon on Saturday, 18th March, 1922, before C. N. Broomsfield, Esq., I.C.S., District and Sessions Judge, Ahmedabad. The Hon. Sir J. T. Strangman, Advocate-General, Bombay, assisted by Mr. A. C. Wild, Legal Remembrancer to the Government of Bombay, and Rao Bahadur Girdarilal, Public Prosecutor, Ahmedabad, conducted the prosecution.

The accused were undefended.

THE CHARGES

The Registrar of the Court read out the charges under S. 124-A, I.P.C., against Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Sankarlal Banker, and also the three articles*—" TAMPERING WITH

*See Appendix.

LOYALTY," "THE PUZZLE AND ITS SOLUTION," and "SHAKING THE MANES"—published in the "YOUNG INDIA" on 29th September '21, 15th December '21 and 23rd February '22, respectively.

The charges having been read out, the Judge briefly explained the charges and called upon the accused to plead to the charge. He asked Mahatma Gandhi whether he pleaded guilty or claimed to be tried.

Mahatma Gandhi: I plead guilty to all the charges. I observe that the King's name has been omitted from the charges and it has been properly omitted.

The Judge: Mr. Banker, do you plead guilty or do you claim to be tried?

Mr. Banker:—I plead guilty.

THE QUESTION OF TRIAL*

Sir T. Strangman, in opening the further proceedings, said under section 271, Criminal Procedure Code, it was open to the Judge to convict the accused on their pleas or to proceed with the trial. He urged that, owing to the gravity of the charges, the consequent desirability in the public interest of fully investigating into them and the fact that in the matter of sentence the judge could not adequately deal with the accused unless he had the full facts before him, the judge should proceed with the trial.

His Honour held it was not necessary in the face of the accused's plea which he proposed to accept.

Mahatma Gandhi smiled at this decision.

The Judge, before passing the sentence, liked to hear Sir T. Strangman. He was entitled to base his general remarks on the charges against the accused and on their pleas.

* For fuller details see "Young India" pp. 1044-45.

Advocate-General's Arguments

Sir T. Strangman, arguing the case for the Crown, said the first point he wanted to make out was that the matter which formed the subject of the present charges formed part of a campaign to spread disaffection openly and systematically, to render Government impossible and to overthrow it. The court was entitled to deal in a more general manner in regard to the question of the sentence than the particular matter resulting in the conviction. These articles were not isolated. They formed part of an organised campaign. After reading extracts from the articles to show their seditious nature, Sir Thomas continued, the accused was a man of high educational qualifications and evidently from his writings, a recognised leader. The harm that was likely to be caused, he said, was considerable. It was true that in the course of those articles they would find non-violence was insisted upon as an item of the campaign and as an item of the creed. But what was the use of preaching non-violence when he preached disaffection towards Government or openly instigated others to overthrow it? The answer to that question appeared to him to come from Chauri-Chaura, Madras and Bombay. These were the circumstances which he asked the court to take into account in sentencing the accused, and it would be for the court to consider those circumstances which must involve sentences of severity.

As regards the second accused his offence was lesser. He did the publication and he did not write. His offence nevertheless was a serious one. His instructions were that he was a man of means and he asked the court to impose a substantial fine in addition to such term of imprisonment as might be inflicted upon. He

quoted section 10 of the Press Act as bearing on the question of fine. When making a declaration, he said, a deposit of Rs. 1,000 to 10,000 was asked in many cases.

MAHATMA GANDHI'S STATEMENT

Court : Mr. Gandhi, do you wish to make a statement on the question of sentence ?

Mahatma Gandhi : I would like to make a statement.

Court : Could you give it to me in writing to put it on record ?

Mahatma Gandhi : I shall give it as soon as I finish reading it.

Mahatma Gandhi then made two statements, one oral and one written in the course of which he recognised the truth of the Advocate Generals contention but that as a patriotic citizen he had—in view of the serious wrongs done to India—no option left but to launch on non-co-operation despite its dangers. For the full text of the statements, see *Young India* pp. 1049-1054

THE JUDGMENT

The following is the full text of the judgment :—

Mr. Gandhi, you have made my task easy one way by pleading guilty to the charge. Nevertheless, what remains, namely, the determination of a just sentence is perhaps as difficult a proposition as a judge in this country could have to face ; the law is no respector of persons. Nevertheless, it will be impossible to ignore the fact that you are in a different category from any person I have ever tried or am likely to have to try. It would be impossible to ignore the fact that in the eyes of millions of your countrymen you are a great patriot

and a great leader. Even those who differ from you in politics look upon you as a man of high ideals and of noble and of even saintly life. I have to deal with you in one character only. It is not my duty and I do not presume to judge or criticise you in any other character. It is my duty to judge you as a man subject to the law who has by his own admission broken the law and committed, what to an ordinary man must appear to be grave offences against the State. I do not forget that you have consistently preached against violence and that you have on many occasions, as I am willing to believe, done much to prevent violence. But having regard to the nature of political teaching and the nature of many of those to whom it was addressed how you could have continued to believe that violence would not be the inevitable consequence, it passes my capacity to understand. There are probably few people in India who do not sincerely regret that you should have made it impossible for any Government to leave you at liberty. But it is so. I am trying to balance what is due to you against what appears to me to be necessary in the interest of the public, and I propose in passing sentence to follow the precedent of a case in many respects similar to this case that was decided some twelve years ago. I mean the case against Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak under the same section. The sentence that was passed upon him as it finally stood was a sentence of simple imprisonment for six years. You will not consider it unreasonable, I think, that you should be classed with Mr. Tilak. That is a sentence of two years' simple imprisonment on each count of the charge, six years in all which I feel it my duty to pass upon you; and I should like to say in doing so that if the course of events in India should make it

possible for the Government to reduce the period and release you no one will be better pleased than I.

The Judge, then, addressing Mr. Banker, said :—

I assume you have been to a large extent under the influence of your chief. The sentence that I propose to pass upon you is simple imprisonment for six months each on the first two counts, that is to say, simple imprisonment for one year, and a fine of thousand rupees on the third count with six months' simple imprisonment in default.

MAHATMA GANDHI'S REPLY

Mahatma Gandhi said, I would say one word since you have done me the honour of recalling the trial of the late Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak. I just want to say that I consider it to be the proudest privilege and honour to be associated with his name. So far as the sentence itself is concerned I certainly consider that it is as light as any judge would inflict on me and so far as the whole proceedings are concerned I must say that I could not have expected greater courtesy.

APPENDIX

The following are the three articles published in "Young India' which formed the subject matter of the charge against Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Banker.

I

Young India, September 19, 1921

TAMPERING WITH LOYALTY

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

His Excellency the Governor of Bombay had warned the public sometime ago, that he 'meant business', that he was not going to tolerate the speeches that were being made. In his note on the Ali Brothers and others he has made clear his meaning. The Ali Brothers are to be charged with having tampered with the loyalty of the sepoy and with having uttered sedition. I must confess, that I was not prepared for the revelation of such hopeless ignorance on the part of the Governor of Bombay. It is evident that he has not followed the course of Indian History during the past twelve months. He evidently does not know, that the National Congress began to tamper with the loyalty of the sepoy in September last year, that the Central Khilafat Committee began it earlier still, for I must be permitted to take the credit or the odium of suggesting, that India had a right openly to tell the sepoy and everyone who served the Government in any capacity whatsoever, that he participated in the wrongs done by the Government. The Conference at Karachi merely repeated the Congress declaration in terms of Islam, but speaking for Hinduism and speaking for nationalism I have no hesitation in saying, that it is sinful for anyone, either as soldier or civilian, to serve this Government which has proved treacherous to the Mussalmans of India and which had been guilty of the inhumanities of the Punjab. I have said this from many a platform in the presence of sepoys. And if I have not asked individual sepoys to come out, it has not been due to want of will but of ability to support them. I have not hesitated to tell the sepoy, that if he could leave the service and support himself without the Congress or the Khilafat aid, he should leave at once. And I promise, that as soon as the spinning

wheel finds an abiding place in every home and Indians begin to feel that weaving gives anybody any day an honourable livelihood, I shall not hesitate, at the peril of being shot, to ask the Indian sepoy individually to leave his service and become a weaver. For, has not the sepoy been used to hold India under subjection, has he not been used to murder innocent people at Jalianwala Bagh, has he not been used to drive away innocent men, women and children during that dreadful night at Chandpur, has he not been used to subjugate the proud Arab of Mesopotamia, has he not been utilised to crush the Egyptians? How can any Indian having a spark of humanity in him and any Mussalman having any pride in his religion feel otherwise than as the Ali Brothers have done? The sepoy has been used more often as a hired assassin than as a soldier defending the liberty or the honour of the weak and the helpless. The Governor has pandered to the basest in us by telling us what would have happened in Malabar but for the British soldier or sepoy. I venture to inform His Excellency, that Malabar Hindus would have fared better without the British bayonets that Hindus and Mussalmans would have jointly appeased the Moplahs, that possibly there being no Khilafat question there would have been no Moplah riot at all, that at the worst supposing that Mussalmans had common cause with the Moplahs, Hinduism would have relied upon its creed of non-vilence and turned every Mussalman into a friend, or Hindu, valour would have been tested and tried. The Governor of Bombay has done a disservice to himself and his cause (whatever it might be) by fomenting Hindu-Mussalman disunion, and has insulted the Hindu as, by letting them infer from his note, that Hindus are helpless creatures unable to die for or defend their hearth, home or religion. If however the Governor is right in his assumptions, the sooner the Hindus die out, the better for humanity. But let me remind His Excellency, that he has pronounced the greatest condemnation upon British rule, in that it finds Indians to-day devoid of enough manliness to defend themselves against looters, whether they are Moplah, Mussalmans or infuriated Hindus of Arrah.

His Excellency's reference to the sedition of Ali Brothers is only less pardonable than his reference to the tampering. For he must know, that sedition has become the creed of the Congress. Every non-co-operator is pledged to preach disaffection towards the Government established by law. Non-co-operation, though a religious and strictly moral movement, deliberately aims at the overthrow of the Government, and is therefore legally seditious in terms of the Indian Penal Code. But this is no new discovery. Lord Chelmsford knew it.

Lord Reading knows it. It is unthinkable that the Governor of Bombay does not know it. It was common cause that so long as the movement remained non-violent nothing would be done to interfere with it.

But it may be urged, that the Government has a right to change its policy when it finds, that the movement is really threatening its very existence as a system. I do not deny its right. I object to the Governor's note, because it is so worded as to let the unknowing public think, that tampering with the loyalty of the sepoy and sedition were fresh crimes committed by the Ali Brothers and brought for the first time to His Excellency's notice.

However the duty of the Congress and Khilafat workers is clear. We ask for no quarter; we expect none from the Government. We did not solicit the promise of immunity from prison so long as we remained non-violent. We may not now complain, if we are imprisoned for sedition. Therefore our self-respect and our pledge require us to remain calm, unperturbed and non-violent. We have our appointed course to follow. We must reiterate from a thousand platforms the formula of the Ali Brothers regarding the sepoys, and we must spread disaffection openly and systematically till it pleases the Government to arrest us. And this we do, not by way of angry retaliation, but because it is our *Dharma*. We must wear *Khadi* even as the Brothers have worn it, and spread the Gospel of Swadeshi. The Mussalmans must collect for Smyrna relief and the Angora Government. We must spread like the Ali Brothers the Gospel of Hindu Muslim Unity and of non-violence for the purpose of attaining Swaraj and the redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs.

We have almost reached the crisis. It is well with a patient who survives a crisis. If on the one hand we remain firm as a rock in the presence of danger, and on the other observe the greatest self-restraint, we shall certainly attain our end this very year.

II

Young India, December 15, 1921

A PUZZLE AND ITS SOLUTION

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Lord Reading is puzzled and perplexed. Speaking in reply to the addresses from the British Indian Association and the Bengal National

Chamber of Commerce at Calcutta, His Excellency said, " I confess that when I contemplate the activities of a section of the community, I find myself still, notwithstanding persistent study ever since I have been in India, puzzled and perplexed. I ask myself what purpose is served by flagrant breaches of the law for the purpose of challenging the Government and in order to compel arrest ? " The answer was partly given by Pandit Motilal Nehru when he said on being arrested that the was being taken to the house of freedom. We seek arrest because he so-called freedom is slavery. We are challenging the might of this Government because we consider its activity to be wholly evil. We want to overthrow the Government. We want to *compel* its submission to the people's will. We desire to show that the Government exists to serve the people, not the people the Government. Free life under the Government has become intolerable, for the price exacted for the retention of freedom is unconscionably great. Whether we are one or many, we must refuse to purchase freedom at the cost of our self-respect or our cherished convictions. I have known even little children become unbending when an attempt has been made to cross their declared purpose, be it ever so flimsy in the estimation of their parents.

Lord Reading must clearly understand that the Non-co-operators are at war with the Government. They have declared rebellion against it in as much as it has committed a breach of faith with the Mussalmans, it has humiliated the Punjab and it insists upon imposing its will upon the people and refuses to repair the breach and repent of the wrong done in the Punjab.

There were two ways open to the people, the way of armed rebellion and the way of peaceful revolt. Non-co-operators have chosen, some out of weakness, some out of strength, the way of peace, *i.e.*, voluntary suffering.*

* Writing in Young India under the heading "Death Dance", further emphasized the importance of Non-violence great though the wrongs done to India were. He wrote: Why is there this chorus of condemnation of the doubling of the salt tax and other taxes on the necessaries of life ? Wonder is expresed that now there is no apology ever offered for the terriffic military charg s of sixtytwo crores. The fact is, it is impossible to offer apology for the inevitable. The military charges must grow with the growing consciousness of the nation. The military is not required for the defence of India. But it is required for the forcible imposition of the English exploiters upon India. That is the naked truth. Mr. Montagu has bluntly but honestly

If the people are behind the sufferers, the Government must yield or be overthrown. If the people are not with them they have at least the satisfaction of not having sold their freedom. In an armed conflict the more violent is generally the victor. The way of peace and suffering is the quickest method of cultivating public opinion, and therefore when victory is attained it is for what the world regards as

---

stated this. The retiring President of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce has said it and so has the Governor of Bombay. They want to trade with us not upon our terms but upon their terms.

It is the same thing whether it is done with the kid glove on or without it. The Councils are the kid glove. We must pay for the glove. The reforms hang upon us like an incubus. They cover a multitude of defects including the blood-sucking salt tax.

They say to us, 'We propose to hold India whether you wish it or not.' We believe that all this is for our good. We think we cannot keep from fighting one another without the protecting power of the British arms. And so, being afraid to die at the hands of our brothers, we are content to live as bond men.

It would be a thousand times better for us to be ruled by a military dictator than to have the dictatorship concealed under sham councils and assemblies. They prolong the agony and increase the expenditure. If we are so anxious to live, it would be more honourable to face the truth and submit to unabashed dictation than to pretend that we are slowly becoming free. There is no such thing as slow freedom. Freedom is like a birth. Till we are fully free, we are slaves. All birth takes place in a moment.

What is this dread of the Congress but the dread of the coming freedom? The Congress has become a grim reality. And therefore it has to be destroyed law or no law. If only sufficient terror can be struck into the hearts of the people, the exploitation can last another century. It is another question whether India itself can last that time under the growing strain or whether the people must, during that time, die like flies. When a man begins to eat a cocoanut, he is not called upon to be tender to the kernel. When he has carved off the last bit he throws away the shell. We do not consider it a heartless performance. No more does the trader consider what he takes from the helpless buyer. A heartless performance, there never is any heart about it. The trader takes all he can and goes his way. It is all a matter of bargain.

The Councilors want their fares and extras, the ministers their

Truth. Bred in the atmosphere of law Courts, Lord Reading finds it difficult to appreciate the peaceful resistance to authority. His Excellency will learn by the time the conflict is over that there is a higher court, than courts of justice and that is the court of conscience. It supersedes all other courts.

Lord Reading is welcome to treat all the sufferers as lunatics, who do not know their own interest. He is entitled therefore to put them out of harm's way. It is an arrangement that entirely suits the lunatics and it is an ideal situation if it also suits the Government. He will have cause to complain if having courted imprisonment, Non-co-opeators fret and fume or 'whine for favours' as Lalaji puts it. The strength of a Non-co-operator lies in his going to goal uncomplainingly. He loses his case if having courted imprisonment he begins to grumble immediately his courtship is rewarded.

The threats used by His Excellency are unbecoming. This is a fight to the finish. It is a conflict between the reign of violence and

---

salaries, the lawyers their fees, the suitors the decrees, the parents such education for their boys as would give them status in the present life, the millionaires want facilities for multiplying their millions and the rest their unmanly peace. The whole revolves beautifully round the central corporation. It is a giddy dance from which no one cares to free himself and so, as the speed increases, the exhilaration is the greater. But it is a death-dance and the exhilaration is induced by the rapid heart beat of a patient who is about to expire.

The expenditure is bound to grow so long as the dance continues. I should not be surprised if the increase is also laid upon the broad shoulders of Non-co-operators. For them, there is only one lesson. They may look upon the increase with philosophic calmness, if they will be but true to their creed. They only way they can prevent it, the only way it will ever be prevented is the way of non-violence. For the greatest part of non-co-operation is withdrawal from the organised violence on which the Government is based. If we want to organise violence to match that of the Government, we must be prepared to incur greater expenditure even than the latter. We may not convince all the dancers of the fatal doom awaiting them, but we must be able to convince the masses who take part in it and sell their freedom to buy so called peace. This we can only do by showing them that non-violence is the way to freedom—not the forced non-violence of the slave, but the willing non-violence of the brave and the free.

of public opinion. Those who are fighting for the latter are determined to submit to any violence rather than surrender their opinion

III

Young India, February 23, 1922

SHAKING THE MANES

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

How can there be any compromise whilst the British Lion continues to shake his gory claws in our faces? Lord Birkenhead reminds us that Britain has lost none of her hard fibre. Mr. Montagu tells us in the plainest language that the British are the most determined nation in the world, who will brook no interference with their purpose. Let me quote the exact words telegraphed by Reuter:—

"If the existence of our Empire were challenged, the discharge of responsibilities of the British Government to India prevented and demands were made in the very mistaken belief that we contemplated retreat from India then India would not challenge with success the most determined people in the world, who would once again answer the challenge with all the vigour and determination at its command."

Both Lord Birkenhead and Mr. Montagu little know that India is prepared for all the hard fibre that can be transported across the seas and that her challenge was issued in the September of 1920 at Calcutta that India would be satisfied with nothing less than Swaraj and full redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs. This does involve the existence of the 'Empire, and if the present custodians of the British Empire are not satisfied with its quiet transformation into a true Commonwealth of free nations, each with equal rights and each having the power to secede at will from an honourable and friendly partnership, all the determination and vigour of 'the most determined people in the world' and the 'hard fibre' will have to be spent in India in a vain effort to crush the spirit that has risen and that will neither bend nor break. It is true that we have no 'hard fibre'. The rice-eating, puny millions of India seem to have resolved upon achieving their own destiny without any further tutelage and without arms. In the Lokamanya's language it is their 'birthright', and they will have it in spite of the 'hard fibre' and in spite of the vigour and determination with which it may be administered. India cannot and will not answer this insolence with insolence, but if she remains true to her pledge, her prayer to God to be delivered from such a scourge

will certainly not go in vain. No empire intoxicated with red wine of power and plunder of weaker races has yet lived long in this world, and this British Empire, which is based upon organised exploitation of physically weaker races of the earth and upon a continuous exhibition of brute force, cannot live if there is a just God ruling the universe. Little do these so-called representatives of the British nation realise that India has already given many of her best men to be dealt with by the British 'hard fibre'. Had Chauri Chaura not interrupted the even course of the national sacrifice, there would have been still greater and more delectable offerings placed before the Lion, but God had willed it otherwise. There is nothing, however, to prevent all those representatives in Downing Street and Whitehall from doing their worst. I am aware that I have written strongly about the insolent threat that has come from across the seas, but it is high time that the British people were made to realise that the fight that was commenced in 1920 is a fight to the finish, whether it lasts one month or one year or many months or many years and whether the representatives of Britain re-enact all the indescribable orgies of the Mutiny days with redoubled force or whether they do not. I shall only hope and pray that God will give India sufficient humility and sufficient strength to remain non-violent to the end. Submission to the insolent challenges that are cabled out on due occasions is now an utter impossibility.

THE HUXLEY PRESS, 27, LINGHA CHETTY STREET, MADRAS

PART VI

MISCELLANEOUS

7th July, 1921

THE PRINCE

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Mr. Baptista has written to the *Bombay Chronicle* on the forthcoming visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and has combated views he imputes to me. Much as I should like for the present to observe silence on this delicate subject I cannot allow it to be said of me that I would 'visit the sins of ministers on the Prince.' I entirely agree with Mr. Baptista that the Prince has no voice in the government and that he is not concerned with the acts of the ministers of the Crown, much less with their blunders. I am just as keen as any one could be to give a royal reception to the Prince and it is because I appreciate the constitution and its working that I would boycott the visit under present conditions. It is because I know that the Royalty is above politics that I would not allow the ministers or the Government of India, if I can help it, to use the Prince for their own political purposes. If I can do nothing else, at least I must not become a tool in the hands of the ministers and the Government of India and allow them, under cover of

the Prince's visit, to make their hold of India tighter and to demonstrate to the world that under their benign administration the whole of India is happy and contented. For let there be no mistake that such will be the result if we remained silent and, under a mistaken sense of loyalty or of the constitution, gave any reception to the Prince. On the contrary, I hope that our loyalty requires us to make it clear to His Majesty's ministers that if they send the Prince to India, we shall be in no mood to join any receptions they might arrange. I would tell them in no veiled language that we are sick at heart over the Khilafat and the Punjab questions and that whilst we are fighting them for very life, we must not be expected to co-operate with them in giving receptions to His Royal Highness. We would be doing a wrong to the public, if we neglected our clear duty of educating them to a truer perception of the meaning of the proposed Royal visit. Let it be known that the Prince will arrive by and with the advice of the ministers, and consent and approval of the Government of India. The visit therefore will be not an act of the Prince but that of the ministers and in boycotting the visit at this juncture we would be visiting their sins upon themselves and not on the Prince. In other words, we would not be playing into their hands. Supposing the ministers sent Sir Michael O'Dwyer to replace Lord Chelmsford and he arranged the reception, would Mr. Baptista have us to fall into Sir Michael's trap! Suppose further that he insulted the Punjab under the Prince's nose by ignoring the Punjab leaders, should the Punjab pocket the insult and join the reception because Royalty is above politics! To say so would be to betray a woeful display of ignoance of the meaning of loyalty and politics.

I venture to suggest that if the Australian people were intensely dissatisfied with the acts or the blunders of the the ministers in the sense we are, they would boycott the visit without the slightest hesitation. The ministers want to make political capital out of the proposed visit. It is our duty to refuse to let them do so.

Mr. Baptista says and I agree that we are in mourning. He therefore hopes that the Prince would not be sent but if he is, Mr. Baptista says, we should give him a welcome in spite of the mourning. I want the Prince to come and therefore I would try to remove the cause of mourning and not take it as a settled fact. I would tell the ministers that as we want to give the Prince an enthusiastic welcome, they should remove the Khilafat and the Punjab grievances. I should further tell them that if they did not do so and still persisted in sending the Prince to India, they would be responsible for placing the people in the awkward position of having to boycott the visit or the reception.

4th August, 1920

WHO IS DISLOYAL?

Mr. Montagu has discovered a new definition of disloyalty.* He considers my suggestion to boycott the visit of the Prince of Wales to be disloyal and some newspapers taking the cue from him have called persons who have made the suggestion 'unmannerly'. They have even attributed to these 'unmannerly' persons the suggestion of 'boycotting the Prince.' I draw a sharp and fundamental distinction between boycotting the

* In the course of a speech in the Commons, Mr. Montagu stated that the movement to boycott the Prince's visit was a disloyal one.

Prince and boycotting any welcome arranged for him. Personally I would extend the heartiest welcome to His Royal Highness if he came or could come without official patronage and the protecting wings of the Government of the day. Being the heir to a constitutional monarch, the Prince's movements are regulated and dictated by the ministers no matter how much the dictation may be concealed beneath diplomatically polite language. In suggesting the boycott therefore the promoters have suggested boycott of an insolent bureaucracy and dishonest ministers of His Majesty.

You cannot have it both ways. It is true that under a constitutional monarchy, the royalty is above politics. But you cannot send the Prince on a political visit for the purpose of making political capital out of him, and then complain that those, who will not play your game and, in order to checkmate you, proclaim a boycott of the Royal visit, do not know constitutional usage. For the Prince's visit is not for pleasure. His Royal Highness is to come, in Mr. Lloyd George's words, as the "ambassador of the British nation," in other words, his own ambassador in order to issue a certificate of merit to him and possibly to give the ministers a new lease of life. The wish is designed to consolidate and strengthen a power that spells mischief for India. Even as it is, Mr. Montagu has foreseen that the welcome will probably be excelled by any hitherto extended to Royalty, meaning that the people are not really and deeply affected and stirred by the official atrocities in the Punjab and the manifestly dishonest breach of official declarations on the Khilafat. With the knowledge that India was bleeding at heart, the Government of India should have told His Majesty's ministers that the moment was inopportune for sending the Prince.

I venture to submit that it is adding insult to injury to bring the Prince and through his visit to steal honours and further prestige for a Government that deserves to be dismissed with disgrace. I claim that I prove my loyalty* by saying that India is in no mood, is too deeply in mourning, to take part in and to welcome His Royal Highness, and that the ministers and the Indian Government show their disloyalty by making the Prince a catspaw of their deep political game. If they persist, it is the clear duty of India to have nothing to do with the visit.

1st December, 1920

ROYAL VISITS: THEIR 'USE' AND ABUSE

(BY C. F. ANDREWS)

With the visit of the Duke of Connaught to this country still pending, it is of the greatest importance for the people of India clearly to understand how these royal visits are often unscrupulously used by Government for political purposes. The idea is, first of all, sedulously propagated that the royal visit has nothing to do with politics; that the Royal Family are above politics —that they are strictly neutral in their political attitude. Then, afterwards, the news is placarded on all sides that a great political success has been obtained. The late King Edward VII was rightly called the greatest

*In *Young India* of 17th November, 1921, Mr. Gandhi wrote in reply to a correspondent, Mr. A. H. Jayasinhani: (1) As a Non-coperater, I neither own nor disown George as my King. I have dissociated myself from the system administered under the King's name. I keep myself free to give my allegiance to him, if I can attain my full growth in his kingdom and can secure full redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs.

diplomatist in the British empire. The present Prince of Wales has now earned the title of 'Our Greatest Ambassador.'"

If it were merely the spreading of messages of good-will and peace to all nations that could be accomplished by such diplomatic and ambassadorial tours, the world might be all the better for them. But the danger always lurks at the back, that some distinctly political objects may be aimed at behind the scenes; that evil systems, which have power and authority behind them, may receive from them an added power and an added authority for oppression of the poor and subjection of the weak. Even to-day, the greater proportion of Europeans on the contiment of Europe believe that the visits of King Edward were used by English politicians for the encirclement of Germany by a ring of hostile powers. Whether that opinion is right or wrong, need not be discussed here. I only wish to point out, how from a bitter past experience, these royal visits are surely feared in Europe. Europe has had her hard lesson to learn; and the proverb is true,—"Once bit, twice shy."

I wish now to tell the story of what happened, behind the scenes, in the Prince of Wales' recent visit to Fiji. The facts have just come to light, and they are most instructive.

The Indian community were suffering, at the time, from a most painful injustice. They had been charged with the offence of stirring up racial hatred against the Europeans and breaking out into 'open rebellion'; yet the truth was simply this, that the Indian labourers were nearly starving and had struck work in order to obtain from the plutocratic Colonial Sugar Refining Company a more just and equitable share of the enormous profits

from sugar. The Colonial Sugar Refining Company had reaped these successive profits out of Indian labour, year after year, during the War. After the war also these had gone on still further increasing. Yet the Company continually refused to share what they had gained with the Indian labourers.

When I was in Fiji in 1917, there was an attempted suicide of an Indian. In open Court the Indian declared that he could not bear to see his young children crying for bread and to have nothing to give them to eat. The judge dismissed him with a warning. That was cold comfort indeed! And what can be said strong enough about the oppression of the poor by this wealthy Sugar Company with its many crores of capital? Yet it held out to the last, against a mere rise in wages of 3d. per day when I tried to negotiate this for the Indian labourers in the Colony in 1917.

The Indian community, when freed at last from indenture, demanded a decent living wage—the wage of a free man and a free woman. I know for certain that the C. S. R. Company could easily have afforded to give this out of its surplus profits. But it would not budge from its hard and fast position; and when at last the strike began, the news was everywhere spread abroad that the Indians were in 'open rebellion' and were proposing to massacre the Europeans. Troops with machine guns, were hurried in a warship of the New Zealand Navy, from Auckland, and the Indian labourers were terrorised back into their work, without getting their rise in wages.

Soon after these troubles, the Indian Community wished to present an address to the Prince of Wales who came to Fiji. They asked permission from the Governor to state their position in the following terms: "We do not think it proper to pain your Royal Highness

by describing our secular difficulties and grievances, which will not remain hidden to your Royal Highness. One thing, however, we are compelled to bring to your notice. It is the fact that we have been misrepresented to the effect that our recent agitation for better rights and economical improvement was based on racial feelings. This has wounded our hearts. This surmise, on the part of the authorities, is not only without any foundation, but is a great slur and an irreparable stain on our character, which should be removed at once"

These were the proposed words. But the Governor cut them out of the address altogether, and substituted others which, while seemingly a mere abbreviation, were actually a perversion of the meaning. The Indians wished to say that the accusation of racial hatred, levelled against *themselves*, were unjust and unbearable. What they were made to say was that there was no racial feeling on the part of any one at all,—either European or Indian. Now this was the opposite of the truth; because the European racial feeling had been excessive. I wish my readers to notice how subtly and cleverly this was done. The Governor of Fiji struck out the words of the address of welcome, which I have stated above, and substituted the following:

"We do not think it proper to refer to political matters. It is inevitable, however, that your Royal Highness should have heard of the recent Indian troubles in Fiji; and we desire to assure you that they were due solely to economic causes and not to any racial feeling."

The Indian Community protested against this perversion of their own meaning. But the Governor of Fiji insisted, and the Indians weakly gave way. The result was that the Prince of Wales was prompted to pick out those very words declaring that there was no racial

feeling, which would camouflage the whole matter. They were telegraphed all over the world by Reuter. We received them here in India. London, and New York, and Capetown, and Tokio, and Melbourne received them also. The Prince stated that "*he was glad to hear that the recent Indian troubles had not been due to any racial feelings.*" Thus the impression was spread abroad, that the Europeans were very good friends of the Indians and were living in social friendliness with them. The truth all the while was this, that the Europeans, as I have said, had brought troops from New Zealand and, by sheer military power, crushed Indians back into accepting the harshest terms of settlement. They had even passed racial laws against the Indians, marking them out from all other races in Fiji.

This incident in Fiji affected the honour of a few thousands of Indians in that colony. The Duke of Connaught's visit will affect the honour of nearly thirty-two crores in India itself. Let us take warning from this weak surrender of our poorer Indian brethren in Fiji. We cannot blame them for that surrender, for their manhood has been crushed by servile labour.

But let *us* not weakly surrender ourselves, or put trust in Governments, which can use such weapons of compulsion as these. The only course, which is dignified and self-respecting, during the coming royal visit of the Duke of Connaught, is to refrain altogether from offering addresses of welcome. Such a royal visit at this crisis is *not* welcome to us. It cannot possibly be welcome. Silence therefore is golden.

9th February, 1921

TO H. R. H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT

The following letter, which has appeared in the Press, was sent by Mr. Gandhi to H. R. H. The Duke of Connaught last week:

Sir,—Your Royal Highness must have heard a great deal about Non-co-operation, Non-co-operationists, and their methods, and, incidentally, of me, its humble author. I fear that the information given your Royal Highness must have been in its nature one-sided. I owe it to you, to my friends and myself, that I should place before you what I conceive to be that scope of Non-co-operation, as followed not only by me, but my closest associates, such as Messrs. Shaukat Ali and Mahomed Ali.

For me it is no joy and pleasure to be actively associated in the boycott of Your Royal Highness' visit. I have tendered loyal, voluntary assistance to the Government for an unbroken period of nearly 30 years in the full belief that through that lay the path of freedom for my country. It was, therefore, no slight thing for me to suggest to my countrymen that we should take no part in welcoming Your Royal Highness. Not one amongst us has anything against you as an English gentlemen. We hold your person as sacred as that of a dearest friend.* I do not know any of my friends who would not guard it with his life if he found it in danger.

* *Young India* of 1st December, 1920, contained the following:

The Duke's Visit.—His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught will be soon in our midst. It is a matter of great sorrow to me that I should have to advise a complete boycott of all public functions held in his honour. He is personally an amiable English gentleman. But, in my humble opinion, public interest demands that this official visit should be strictly ignored. His Royal Highness comes to sustain

We are not at war with individual Englishmen. We seek not to destroy English life. We do desire to destroy the system that has emasculated our country in body, mind, and soul. We are determined to battle with all our might against that in English nature which has made O'Dwyerism and Dyerism possible in the Punjab and has resulted in a wanton affront upon Islam, a faith professed by seven crores of our country-men. We consider it inconsistent with our self-respect any longer to brook the spirt of superiority and dominance which has systematically ignored and dis-regarded the sentiments of thirty crores of innocent people of India on many a vital matter. It is humiliating to us. It cannot be a matter of pride to you that thirty crores of Indians should live day in and day out in fear of their lives from one hundred thousand Englishmen and, therefore, be under subjection to them.

Your Royal Highness has come, not to end the system I described, but to sustain it by upholding its prestige. Your first pronouncement was a laudation of Lord Willingdon. I have the privilege of knowing him. I believe him to be an honest, amiable gentleman, who will not willingly hurt even a fly, but he certainly failed as a ruler. He allowed himself to be guided by those whose interest it was to support their power. He is not reading the mind of the Dravidian province. Here, in

---

a corrupt system of government, he comes to whitewash an irrespon-sible bureaucracy, he comes to make us forget the unforgettable, he comes not to heal the wounds inflicted upon us, but to mock us by flinging deceptive reforms at us. To welcome His Royal Highness is to associate with him in promoting our own dishonour. No government official, whether he be European or Indian, has a right to claim any welcome or honour from us so long as the government, whose power he represents, remains unrepentant and unresponsive to the one thing needful.

Bengal, you are issuing a certificate of merit to a Governor who is again, from all I have heard, an estimable gentleman, but who knows nothing of the heart of Bengal and its yearnings. Bengal is not Calcutta. Fort William and the palaces of Calcutta represent an insolent exploitation of the unmurmuring and highly cultured peasantry of this fair province.

The Non-co-operationists have come to the conclusion that they must not be deceived by the reforms that tinker with the problem of India's distress and humiliation, nor must they be impatient and angry. We must not in our impatient anger resort to stupid violence. We freely admit that we must take our due share of blame for the existing state. It is not so much British guns that are responsible for our subjection as our voluntary co-operation.

Our non-participation in a hearty welcome to Your Royal Highness is thus in no sense a demonstration against your high personage, but it is against the system you come to uphold. I know individual Englishmen cannot, even if they will, alter the English nature all of a sudden. If we would be the equals of Englishmen, we must cast off fear. We must learn to be self-reliant and independent of schools, courts, protection, and patronage of a Government we seek to end, if it will not mend.

Hence this non-violent Non-co-operation. I know we have not all yet become non-violent in speech and deed, but the results so far achieved have, I assure Your Royal Highness, been amazing. The people have understood the secret and value of non-violence as they have never done before. He, who will, may see that this is a religious, purifying movement. We are leaving off drink. We are trying to rid India of the curse of untouchability.

We are trying to throw off foreign tinsel splendour, and by reverting to the spinning wheel reviving the ancient and poetic simplicity of life. We hope thereby to sterilize the existing harmful institutions.

I ask Your Royal Highness as an Englishman to study this movement and its possibilities for the Empire and the world. We are at war with nothing that is good in the world. In protecting Islam in the manner we are, we are protecting all religions; in protecting the honour of India, we are protecting the honour of humanity. For our means are hurtful to none. We desire to live on terms of friendship with Englishmen, but that friendship must be friendship of equals both in theory and in practice, and we must continue to non-co-operate, *i.e.*, to purify ourselves till the goal is achieved. I ask Your Royal Highness, and through you every Englishman, to appreciate the view-point of Non-co-operation.

I beg to remain,
Your Royal Highness' faithful servant,
(Sd.) M. K. GANDHI.

27th October, 1921

HONOUR THE PRINCE

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The reader must not be surprised at the title of this writing. Supposing that the Prince was a blood brother in a high place, supposing that he was to be exploited by neighbours for their own base ends, supposing further that he was in the hands of my neighbours, that my voice could not effectively reach him and that he was being brought to my village by the said neighbours, would I not honour him best by dissociating

myself from all the ceremonial that might be arranged in his 'honour' in the process of exploitation and by letting him know by every means at my disposal that he was being exploited?* Would I not be a traitor to him if I did not warn him against entering the trap prepared for him by my neighbours?

I have no manner of doubt that the Prince's visit is being exploited for advertising the 'benign' British rule in India. It is a crime against us if His Royal Highness is being brought for personal pleasure and sport when India is seething with discontent, when the masses are saturated with disaffection towards the system under which they are governed, when famine is raging in

* The following appeared in *Young India* of 10th July, 1921:

The Prince's Proposed Visit—It is a great pity that the talk of the Prince's visit has been revived and a provisional date fixed. India will refuse to welcome a representative of a system of which she is sick unto death. And if his visit is forced upon an unwilling India, there must be the same effective *hartal* on the day of His Royal Highness's visit that there was on the Duke's visit. I repeat once more that Non-co-operators have nothing against the Prince as a man. But he cannot be divested of the office he holds. Whilst it is true that the King and his heirs do not actively meddle in the affairs of state (which is a convenience for the state), he is as effective a representative of the existing system of Government as the most meddlesome Prime Minister or Viceroy. I am disposed to think that, as a supporter of the institution, he is more effective by reason of his isolation. If the Prince comes, he will not come to bless the Non-co-operators or the cause, but to sing the song of praise for a Government which is responsible for the dishonour of the Punjab, for breach of faith with the Mussalmans, for forcing the drink traffic on India, for impoverishing her and for so emasculating her that she almost thinks she must remain in slavery for an unthinkable time. In my humble opinion, the projected visit will be an insult added to injury. And it will be the duty of every Non-co-operator, respectfully but firmly and in no unmistakable manner, to express his strong disapproval of all such efforts to bolster up a system which is tottering to its fall.—M. K. G.

Khulna and the Ceded Districts and when an armed conflict is raging in Malabar: it is a crime against India to spend millions of rupees on a mere show when millions of men are living in a state of chronic starvation. Eight lacs of rupees have been voted away by the Bombay Council alone for the pageant.

The visit is being heralded by repression in the land. In Sindh, over-fifty six Non-co-operators are in goal. Some of the bravest of Mussalmans are being tried for holding certain opinions.* Nineteen Bengal workers have been just imprisoned, including Mr. Sen Gupta, the leading Barrister of the place. A Mussalman Pir and three other selfless workers are already in gaol for a similar 'crime'. Several leaders of Karnatak are also imprisoned, and now its chief man is on trial for saying what I have said repeatedly in these columns and what Congressmen have been saying all over during the past twelve months. Several leaders of the Central Provinces have been similarly deprived of their liberty. A most popular doctor, Dr. Paranjapye, a man universally respected for his selflessness, is suffering rigorous imprisonment like a common felon. I have by no means exhausted the list of imprisonments of Non-co-operators. Whether they are a test of real crime or an answer to growing disaffection, the Prince's visit is, to say the least, most inopportune. There is no doubt that the people do not want His Royal Highness to visit India at the present juncture. They have expressed their opinion in no uncertain terms. They have declared that Bombay should observe *Hartal* on the day of his landing at Bombay. It is a clear imposition upon the people to bring the Prince in the teeth of their opposition.

* See *infra*.

What are we to do in the circumstances? We must organise a complete boycott of all functions held in the Prince's honour. We must religiously refrain from attending charities, fetes or fire-works organised for the purpose. We must refuse to illuminate or to send our children to see the organised illuminations. To this end we must publish leaflets by the million and distribute them amongst the people telling them what their duty in the matter is, and it would be true honour done to the Prince if Bombay on the day of his landing wears the appearance of a deserted city.

But we must isolate the Prince from the person. We have no ill-will against the Prince as man. He probably knows nothing of the feeling in India, he probably knows nothing about repression. Equally probably he is ignorant of the fact that the Punjab wound is still bleeding, that the treachery towards India in the matter of the Khilafat is still rankling in every Indian breast, and that on the Government's own admission the reformed councils contain members who, though nominally elected, do not in any sense represent even the few lacs who are on the electoral rolls. To do or to attempt to do any harm to the person of the Prince would be not only cruel and inhuman, but it would be on our part a piece of treachery towards ourselves and him, for we have voluntarily pledged ourselves to be and remain non-violent. Any injury or insult to the Prince by us will be a greater wrong done by us to Islam and India than any the English have done. They know no better. We can lay no such claim to ignorance, we have with our eyes open and before God and man promised not to hurt a single individual in any way connected with the system we are straining every nerve to destroy. It must therefore be our duty to take every precaution

to protect his person as our own from all harm. In spite of all our effort, we know that there will be some who would want to take part in the various functions from fear or hope or choice. They have as much right to do what they like as we have to do what we like. That is the test of the freedom we wish to have and enjoy. Let us, whilst we are being subjected by an insolent bureaucracy to a severe irritation, exercise the greatest restraint. And if we can exhibit our firm resolve to have nothing to do with it by dissociating ourselves from its pageant and at the same time we show forbearance towards those who differ from us, we would advance our cause in a most effective manner.

29th December, 1920

'ONE STEP ENOUGH FOR ME'

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Mr. Stokes is a Christian who wants to follow the light that God gives him. He has adopted India as his home. He is watching the Non-co-operation movement from the Kotagiri hills where he is living in isolation from the India of the plains, and serving the hillmen. He has contributed three articles* on Non-co-operation to the columns of the *Servant* of Calcutta and other papers. I had the pleasure of reading them during my Bengal tour. Mr. Stokes approves of Non-co-operation but dreads the consequences that may follow complete success, *i.e.*, evacuation of India by the British. He conjures up before his mind a picture of India invaded by the Afghans from the North-West, plundered by the

* Omitted in this collection. For Mr. Stokes' views, *see* his *National Self-realisation.*

Gurkhas from the Hills. For me I say with Cardinal Newman: 'I do not ask to see the distant scene; one step enough for me.' The business is essentially religious. The business of every God-fearing man is to dissociate himself from evil in total disregard of consequences. He must have faith in a good deed producing only a good result: that in my opinion is the *Gita* doctrine of work without attachment. God does not permit him to peep into the future. He follows truth, although the following of it may endanger his very life. He knows that it is better to die in the way of God than to live in the way of Satan. Therefore whoever is satisfied that this Government represents the activity of Satan has no choice left to him but to dissociate himself from it.

However, let us consider the worst that can happen to India on a sudden evacuation of India by the British. What does it matter that the Gurkhas and the Pathans attack us? Surely we would be better able to deal with their violence than we are with the continued violence, moral and physical, perpetrated by the present government. Mr. Stokes does not seem to eschew the use of physical force. Surely the combined labour of the Rajput, the Sikh and the Mussalman warrior in a united India may be trusted to deal with plunders from any or all the sides. Imagine however the worst: Japan overwhelming us from the Bay of Bengal, the Gurkhas from the Hills, and the Pathans from the North-West. If we do not succeed in driving them out, we make terms with them and drive them out at the first opportunity. This will be a more manly course than a helpless submission to an admittedly wrongful State.

But I refuse to contemplate the dismal outlook. If the movement succeeds through Non-violent Non-co-

operation, and that is the supposition Mr. Stokes has started with, the English whether they remain or retire, they will do so as friends and under a well-ordered agreement as between partners. I still believe in the goodness of human nature, whether it is English or any other. I therefore do not believe that the English will leave in 'a night'.

And do I consider the Gurkha and the Afghan being incorrigible thieves and robbers without ability to respond to purifying influences? I do not. If India returns to her spirituality, it will react upon the neighbouring tribes;* she will interest herself in the welfare of these hardy but poor people, and even support them if necessary, not out of fear but as a matter of neighbourly duty. She will have dealt with Japan simultaneously with the British. Japan will not want to invade India, if India has learnt to consider it a sin to use a single foreign article that she can manufacture within her own borders. She produces enough to eat, and her men and women can without difficulty manufacture enough cloth to cover their nakedness and protect themselves from heat and cold. We become prey to invasion if we excite the greed of foreign nations by dealing with them under a feeling of dependence on them. We must learn to be independent of everyone of them.

Whether therefore we finally succeed through violence or Non-violence, in my opinion, the prospect is by no means so gloomy as Mr. Stokes has imagined. Any conceivable prospect is, in my opinion, less black than the present unmanly and helpless condition. And we

*Mr. Andrews writes that it was the Mahatma's intention to work among the border tribes and make them friends and even die in the attempt if necessary. *See* his *Terence MacSwiney and the new World Movement.*

cannot do better than following out fearlessly and with confidence the open and honourable programme of Non-violence and sacrifice that we have mapped for ourselves.*

4th May, 1921

THE AFGHAN BOGEY

(By M. K. Gandhi)

The reader will find elsewhere a string of questions put by a correspondent.† The most important relates to a speech delivered by Maulana Mahomed Ali on the fear of an Afghan invasion. I have not read Maulana Mahomed Ali's speech referred to by the correspondent. But whether he does or not, I would, in a sense, certainly assist the Amir of Afghanistan if he waged war against the British Government. That is to say, I would openly tell my countrymen that it would be a crime to help a Government which had lost the confidence of the nation to remain in power. On the other hand, I would not ask Indians to raise levies for the Amir. That would be against the creed of non-violence accepted by both Hindus and Muslims for the purpose of the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj. And I apprehend that Maulana Mahomed Ali could not mean more in his speech than what I have suggested. He could not very well do otherwise, so long as the Hindu-Muslim compact subsists. But it would be found upon an examination of the case, that the compact is indissoluble. Dissolution of the compact

* The Congress Working Committee advocated in October, 1921, a foreign policy for India based on these principles and condemned the use of Indian troops abroad in Mesopotamia, etc., with whose peoples the Indians had no quarrel.

† Some of these questions are answered elsewhere. See page 651.

means destruction of India's purpose. I cannot conceive the present possibility of Hindus and Muslims entering upon a joint armed revolt. And Muslims can hardly expect to succeed with any plan of an armed revolt.

However, I warn the reader against believing in the bogey of an Afghan invasion. Their own military writers have often let us into the secret that many of the punitive expeditions were manufactured for giving the soldiers a training or keeping idle armed men occupied. A weak, disarmed, helpless, credulous India does not know how this Government has kept her under its hypnotic spell. Even some of the best of us to-day really believe that the military budget is being piled up for protecting India against foreign aggression. I suggest that it is being piled up for want of faith in the Sikhs, the Gurkhas, the Pathans, and the Rajputs, *i. e.*, for want of faith in us and for the purpose of keeping us under forced subjection. My belief (I write under correction) is that the anxiety of the Government always to have a treaty with the Amir was based, not so much upon the fear of a Russian invasion as upon the fear of losing the confidence of the Indian soldiery. To-day there is certainly no fear of a Russian invasion. I have never believed in the Bolshevik menace. And why should any Indian Government, to use the favourite phrase of the erstwhile idol of Bengal, 'broad-based upon a people's affection,' fear Russian, Bolshevik or any menace? Surely a contented, and a powerful India (all the more), in alliance with Great Britain, can any day meet any invasion upon her. But this Government has deliberately emasculated us, kept us under the perpetual fear of our neighbours and the whole world, and drained India of her splendid resources so that she has lost faith in herself either for defence or for dealing with the simple problem

of the growing poverty. I, therefore, do certainly hope that the Amir will not enter into any treaty with this Government. Any such treaty can only mean unholy bargain against Islam and India. This Government being unwilling to part with O'Dwyerism as an 'emergency' measure, being unwilling to keep its faith with the Muslims, (I must decline to treat the Government of India separately from the Imperial Government) and being unwilling to let India rise to her full height, wants Afghanisthan to enter into a treaty of offence against India.* I hope that there is but one opinion so far as

*On Mr. Andrews asking Mr. Gandhi whether the above article was not an invitation to the Afghans to invade India and whether thereby he did not become a party to violence, Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of 18th May, 1921, denying that he invited Afghans, expressing his anxiety that they should not go to India's assistance and affirming that India was quite capable of settling with the Government without extraneous aid. He added:

'What however I would do is totally different from what I can do. I am sorry to have to confess that the movement has not yet acquired such hold on the soldier class as to enbolden them to refuse assistance to the Government in time of need. When the soldier class has realised that they live for the nation, and that it is a travesty of a soldier's calling when he undertakes to kill to order, the battle of India's worldly freedom is won without more. As it is, the Indian soldier is as much subject to fear as the layman. He fills the recruiting ranks, because he believes that there is no other means of livelihood. The Government has made the profession of killing attractive by a system of special rewards, and by a system of skilfully devised punishments has made it well nigh impossible for the soldier, once he is in, to get out without difficulty. In these circumstances I do not delude myself with the belief that the British Government will be without Indian help in the event of an immediate Afghan invasion. But it was my duty, especially when challenged, to put before the nation the position logically arising from Non-co-operation. It was necessary, too, to warn the nation against being frightened by the Afghan bogey.

The second part of the question contains, in my opinion, a miscon-

Non-co-operators are concerned. Whilst unwilling ourselves, we cannot wish others to co-operate with the Government.

---

25 May, 1921

THE FRONTIER FRIENDS

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The Punjabees living on the Frontier deserve the sympathy of the whole of India. They are exposed to attacks from the neighbouring tribes, they are defenceless, and from all the accounts received by me, the Government seem to give them little or no protection,
and now-a-days the r... for the officers, if any one
complains, is to r... complainant to the Ali
Brothers and to m... charge of the Frontier, I
...w what we ... We would certainly
...l in ... de... nd the unarmed po-
... ve would have, if necessary,
... for self-defence. But what is
... on over the tribesmen and turned
... bands into trustworthy neigh-
... take things as they are. I
...ume ... dus and the Mussalmans are

ception of Non-violence. It is no part of the duty of a Non-violent Non-co-operator to assist the Government against war made upon it by others. A Non-violent Non-co-operator may not secretly or openly encourage or assist any such war. He may not take part directly or indirectly in it. But it is no part of his duty to help the Government to end the war. On the contrary, his prayer would be, as it must be, for the defeat of a power which he seeks to destroy. I, therefore, so far as my creed of Non-violence is concerned, can contemplate an Afghan invasion with perfect equanimity, and equally so far as India's safety is concerned.

friendly to one another, and that no Mussalman traitorously helps the tribesmen against his Hindu brothers. The Mussalman population on this side of the Frontier is in an exceptionally strong position to help.

We must not despair of the tribesmen. We have too often considered them to be hopeless. In my opinion, they are amenable to reason. They are God-fearing. They do not loot merely for pleasure. I believe that they are themselves coming under the influence of the wave of self-purification that is spreading.

I know that the process of reforming the tribesmen is slow and tedious. It provides poor comfort to those that are robbed of their possessions or their dear ones.

The difficulty is to be traced to the same cause we fear Englishmen, and we hav[illegible]come slaves. We fear the tribesmen and we are [illegible] with our slavery, we are thankful that we are [illegible] the former against the latter. I cannot ima[illegible]iliation for [illegible] self-respecting man t[illegible] the [illegible] himself or his family, on tho[illegible] him. I would prefer total destru[illegible] all to purchasing safety at the [illegible] This feeling of helplessness in u[illegible] our deliberate dismissal of God f[illegible] We have become atheists for a[illegible] purpose. And therefore we believe that in the long run we must rely upon physical force for our protection. In the face of physical danger, we cast all our philosophy to the winds. Our daily life is a negation of God. If then we would but have a little trust in God, *i.e.*, ourselves, we shall find no difficulty with the tribesmen. Only in that case, we will have to be prepared at times to surrender our possessions and under certain circumstances our lives rather than our honour. We must refuse to believe

that our neighbours are savages incapable of responding to the finer instincts in man.

Thus consistently with our self-respect there are but two courses open to us, to prepare in so far as we wish to defend ourselves, however weakly, against robbery and plunder, or to believe in the capacity of our neighbours to respond to the nobler instinct in man and to endeavour to reform the tribesmen. I apprehend that the two processes will go hand in hand. We must avoid the third at any cost, that is, reliance on the British bullet to protect us from harm. It is the surest way to national suicide.

If my writings can reach the tribesmen, I would certainly urge them to leave their predatory habits.* Inasmuch as they loot [illegible] ngle man or woman, they belie the teaching of th[illegible] het whose name they prize above all others an[illegible] ey believe to be the messenger of the [illegible] d justice. It is the duty [illegible] M[illegible] a who has any influence [illegible] il them that if they will play

[illegible] a in *Young India* of 5th May, 1921, under [illegible] at the Border:"

[illegible] dnapping a European girl by tribesmen on [illegible] rs that they are no respecters of persons. The A[illegible] d has however published from its correspondent h[illegible] f kidnapping of Hindus. Several Hindus from the N. W. Border have also been coming to Mr. Gandhi, complaining of members of their families having been kidnapped and ransomed after heavy payments. One man from Bannu told him that his people were obliged to pay Rs. 14,000 as ransom. The Hindu complainants have even been questioning the utility of Hindu-Muslim unity if such things could happen at the Border. With all our desire to secure relief from the the depredations complained of, we fail to see how Hindu-Muslim unity can be blamed for the continuance of the mischief. The Mahomedans of India have as a rule as much or as little influence as the Hindus over these free booting tribes who have been known to

their part in defending Islam from impending danger, the least they can do is to refrain from molesting their neighbours, who have done not only no harm to them but who, whether they are Hindus or Mussalmans, are doing their best to safeguard the honour of Islam.

The following appeared in "Young India" of 13th July, 1921:

Frontier Friends.—Mr. Mahomed Nawezkhan, B.A., LL. B., of Bannu, writes a long letter on my appeal to the Frontier Friends. I propose to give a brief summary of it instead of reproducing the whole letter, which is too discursive for the columns of "Young India." He thinks that the tribesmen who [illegible]rn the message will gladly respond. He traces th[illegible]y of the annexation of the territory of the tribes[illegible] proves that before these territories were ann[illegible] practically n[illegible] raids. Moreover, all we[illegible]d the[illegible] the raided parties were well[illegible] selves. But after annexation, th[illegible] wantonly robbed of their lands trea[illegible]

carry away Mahomedans almost as frequen[illegible] instance, it is the office of the Governm[illegible] villages from the free booters. Secondly, [illegible] them-selves to be resourceful enough, to combin[illegible]sisting the attacks of desperadoes. Thirdly, both the Hindus and the Maho-medans living in these Border villages should open communication with the tribesmen and induce them to behave better, promising them pecuniary help for a temporary period if they are likely to starve, having been used for generations to live simply on depredations. And lastly, it is certainly expected of those Mahomedans who have any influence over or connection with the tribesmen to wean them from their unneighbourly habits. If all the remedies are simultaneously adopted, we have no doubt that the evil will be brought under control, if it is not entirely eradicated.

and the Mussalman inhabitants of the annexed territories as their enemies, the more so as the latter helped the Government in subduing the tribesmen.' The writer, who claims an intimate acquaintance with the situation, is of opinion that the tribesmen have been no respecters of religions, and have subjected to their depredations the Hindus and the Mussalmans alike, and that Mussalmans have never been known to assist the Hindus against the raiders. In proof of impartiality, the writer instances the cordial treatment meted out to the Hindus in the independent territory of the Frontier tribes. He states that the Hindus living there have greater freedom of worship than even in the British territory. Their social status is any day better than under the British Government, and the Maliks are ever ready with all their might to defend their Hindu friends living within their jurisdiction. The writer gives it as his judgment that the British Government in the Frontier Province has sinfully abdicated its function of protecting the inhabitants, who have unfortunately come under the so-called protecting wings of the British Empire. He winds up his letter by saying that the Frontier regulations are worth studying, the procedure there is most arbitrary, and the life and property of the people are at the mercy of military officers who are incapable of giving judicial decisions. Extra Assistant Commissioners, he says, in effect disgrace their commissions and become instruments of injustice and oppression. No man's honour is safe in the hands of these administrators. They have the power to put under lock-up any respectable man upon the slightest suspicion.

1st June, 1921

THE AFGHAN ALARM

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

It must be a matter of surprise to many people as it is to me that Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal should be alarmed at the Afghan cry raised in interested quarters. He is a believer in full Swaraj, and I venture to suggest to Mr. Pal that we cannot establish Swaraj in India, till we rid ourselves of the feeling of helplessness. Swaraj means our preparedness to deal with the Afghan and every other menace in our country. The whole scheme of Non-co-operation is based on trusting other people, and if they prove untrustworthy, on our being prepared to meet their deceit by self-suffering. I remind Mr. Pal of what he truly said at Allahabad at the Hindu-Mahomedan Conference in reply to Dr. Sapru that the same power of combination, resourcefulness and suffering that would end the present system of slavery, would enable us to deal with every other system of a similar nature.

Pan-Islamism, which Mr. Pal fears, is an admirable doctrine in so far as a Mussalman wishes the solidarity of all Moslem states. It would be a dangerous doctrine, if it were to mean a combination of Islamic powers for the purpose of exploiting the world or converting it to Islam by force. No sane Mussalman of my acquaintance has ever entertained the latter idea. The world is growing sick of the domination of brute force.

I assure Mr. Pal that I do not believe in flirtation with any sentiment. I reject those that are bad, and hug those that are good. I do not believe that serious Mussalmans will welcome Afghan rule, any more than serious Hindus would. In writing my article on the Afghan Bogey, I was minded only to defend the correct

position of a comrade, and to warn India against being frightened by the interested cry.

I totally dissent from Mr. Pal's view that the event of an Afghan invasion, or even the mere circulation of a rumour of such invasion, will incite a very large part of our Muslim population to lawlessness, if not to open "revolt." On the contrary, it is my firm belief that the Mussalmans have too much at stake to-day—the honour of their religion—to do any such foolish act. As Maulana Shaukat Ali has said so often, the Mussalmans are too shrewd to mix up violence with non-violence. Mr. Pal has done a grave injustice to the Hindus by attributing to 'a very large proportion' of Hindus 'a desire to settle their own account with the Mahomedans.' He has, I venture to assure him, entirely misread the Hindu mind. The Hindus are as much in earnest about the cow, as the Mussalmans about the Khilafat. And the former know that they cannot save the cow—the cherished dream of every Hindu—without the goodwill of the latter. I promise that the Hindus will forget every wrong done in the past by every Mussalman, when the latter help them to save the cow, as I know every Mussalman will feel eternally grateful to the Hindus, if he finds that he has retrieved the honour of Islam by their voluntary aid.

I deny *in toto* the truth of the proposition laid down by Mr. Pal that Muslims and Hindus would welcome an Afghan invasion. The protests that have been made against the supposed intentions of Maulana Mahomed Ali are surely enough to convince anybody that India will not tolerate an Afghan invasion.

Mr. Pal suggests that, if the Amir invades and if we do not aid the Government, there can only be a revolution. I venture to suggest another alternative. If India

as a Non-co-operating India does not assist, the Government will make terms with the people. I do not consider the British people to be so utterly devoid of commonsense or resourcefulness as to leave India, rather than come to terms with her and heal the Khilafat and the Punjab wounds. That India does not yet possess the power to command attention, I know only too well. I have simply suggested a contingent alternative.

Mr. Pal sees a difference between Lalaji's and my declaration at Simla and our previous declarations. I know none—neither Lalaji nor I—have ever welcomed an Afghan invasion. But I gladly lay down my own position in categorical terms.

(1) I do not believe that the Afghans want to invade India.

(2) I believe that the Government is fully prepared to meet an Afghan invasion.

(3) I am sorry to confess that, if there was an Afghan invasion, every Raja and Maharaja will render unconditional assistance to the Government.

(4) I believe too that we as a people are still so demoralised, diffident and distrustful of Afghan intentions, and Hindus and Mussalmans of one another, that many would in mere panic rush to the help of the Government and thus still further strengthen the chain that binds India.

(5) In theory, it is possible to distinguish between an invasion of India and no invasion of the British Government for the purpose of the Khilafat. In practice, I do not believe in the Afghans invading India to embarrass the Government, and being able in the event of being successful to resist the temptation of establishing a kingdom in India.

(6) In spite of such belief, I hold it to be contrary to

the faith of a Non-coperator to tender unconditional assistance to a Government which he seeks to end or mend.

(7) A handful of conscientious objectors may make no impression on the then current of events, but they will sow the seed for raising a manly India.

(8) I would rather see India perish at the hands of Afghans, than purchase freedom from Afghan invasion at the cost of her honour. To have India defended by an unrepentant Government that keeps the Khilafat and the Punjab wounds still bleeding is to sell India's honour.

(9) My faith, however, in the British nation is such that when we have shown sufficient strength of purpose, and undergone enough measure of self-sacrifice, the British people will respond fully. My reading of history is that they do not yield to justice pure and simple. It is too abstract for their 'commonsense.' But they are far-seeing enough to respond to justice when it is allied with force. Whether it is brute-force, or soul-force, they do not mind.

(10) It is the duty of every Non-co-operator to let the Afghans know that he believes in the capacity of Non-co-operation to restore the Khilafat to the pre-war status, and that India does not want their armed intervention, that Non-co-operators would appreciate their refusal to enter into any deal with the British Government for holding India in subjection, and that India has none but the friendliest feelings for her neighbours.

CONDITION OF LABOUR

Mr. Gandhi writes in the "Nava Jivan" of the 8th instant:

Two paths are open before India to-day, either to

introduce the western principle of 'Might is right' or to uphold the eastern principle that truth alone conquers, that truth knows no mishap, that the strong and the weak have alike a right to secure justice. The choice is to begin with the labouring class. Should the labourers obtain an increment in their wages by violence, even if that be possible, they cannot resort to anything like violence, howsoever legitimate may be their claims. To use violence for securing rights may seem an easy path, but it proves to be thorny in the long run. Those who live by sword die also by sword. The swimmer often dies by drowning. Look at Europe. No one seems to be happy there, for, not one is contented. The labourer does not trust the capitalist and the capitalist has no faith in the labourer. Both have a sort of vigour and strength but even the bulls have it. They fight to the very bitter end. All motion is not progress. We have got no reason to believe that the people of Europe are progressing. Their possession of wealth does not argue the possession of any moral or spiritual qualities. King Duryodhan was a master of untold wealth, but with all that he was a pauper in comparison to Vidura and Sudama. To-day the world adores Vidura and Sudama, whereas Duryodhan's name is remembered only as a byword for the evil qualities one should shun.

What shall we do then? The labourers in Bombay made a fine stand. I was not in a position to know all the facts. But this much I could see that they could fight in a better way. The mill owner may be wholly in the wrong. In the struggle between capital and labour, it may be generally said that more often than not the capitalists are in the wrong box. But when labour comes fully to realise its strength, I know it can become more tyrannical than capital. The millowners will have

to work on the terms dictated by labour if the latter could command intelligence of the former. It is clear, however, that labour will never attain to that intelligence. If it does, labour will cease to be labour and become itself the master. The capitalists do not fight on the strength of money alone. They do possess intelligence and tact.

The question before us is this: When the labourers, remaining what they are, develop a certain consciousness, what should be their course? It would be suicidal if the labourers rely upon their numbers or brute-force *i.e.* violence. By so doing they will do harm to industries in the country. If, on the other hand, they take their stand on pure justice and suffer in their person to secure it, not only will they always succeed but they will reform their masters, develop industries and both master and men will be as members of one and the same family. A satisfactory solution of the condition of labour must include the following:

(1) The hours of labour must leave the workmen some hours of leisure.

(2) They must get facilities for their own education.

(3) Provision should be made for an adequate supply of milk, clothing and necessary education for their children.

(4) There should be sanitary dwellings for the workmen.

(5) They should be in a position to save enough to maintain themselves during their old age.

None of these conditions is satisfied to-day. For this both the parties are responsible. The masters care only for the service they get. What becomes of the labourer does not concern them. All their endeavours are generally confined to obtaining maximum service with

minimum payment. The labourer, on the other hand, tries to hit upon all tricks whereby he can get maximum pay with minimum work. The result is that although the labourers get an increment there is no improvement in the work turned out. The relations between the two parties are not purified and the labourers do not make proper use of the increment they get.

A third party has sprung up between these two parties. It has become the labourers' friend. There is need for such a party. Only to the extent to which this party has disinterested friendship for the labourers can it befriend them.

A time has come now when attempts will be made to use labour as a pawn in more ways than one. The occasion demands consideration at the hands of those that would take part in politics. What will they choose? Their own interest or the service of labour and the nation? Labour stands in sore need of friends. It cannot proceed without a lead. What sort of men give this lead will decide the condition of labour.

Strikes, cessation of work and Hartal are wonderful things no doubt, but it is not difficult to abuse them. Workmen ought to organise themselves into strong Labour Unions, and on no account shall they strike work without the consent of these Unions. Strikes should not be risked without previous negotiations with the mill-owners. If the mill-owners resort to arbitration, the principle of *Panchayat* should be accepted. And once the *Panch* are appointed, their decision must be accepted by both the parties alike, whether they like it or not.

Readers, if you are interested in ameliorating the condition of labour, if you want to befriend the workman and serve him, you will see from the above that there is

only one royal road before you, *viz.*, to elevate the workmen by creating between the two parties family relationship. And to secure this end there is no path like Truth. Mere increase in wages should not satisfy you; you must also watch by what means they get it and how they spend it.

6th October, 1921

WAGES AND VALUES

The following is a free rendering of Mr. Gandhi's address to the millhands of Ahmedabad on the occasion of the second anniversary of the struggle that took place in 1917, between the mill owner and the mill-hands:

I do not propose to examine the duty of the capitalist. If the labourer alone were to understand his rights and responsibilities and confine himself to the purest means, both must gain. But two things are needful—both the demands and the means adopted to enforce them must be just and clear. It is an unlawful demand which seeks merely to take advantage of the capitalists' position. But it is an altogether lawful demand when the labourer asks for enough wages to enable him to maintain himself and to educate his children decently. To seek justice without resorting to violence and by an appeal to the goodsense of the capitalist by arbitration is lawful means.

In order to achieve the end, you must have Unions. A beginning has already been made. I trust that the mill-hands in every department will form their Unions and every one should scrupulously observe the rules that may be formed for them. You will then approach the mill-owners through your Unions and if,

the decisions of the former do not satisfy you, you will appeal to arbitration. It is matter of satisfaction that both parties have accepted the principle of arbitration. I hope that that principle will be fully developed and that strikes will for ever become an impossibility. I know that strikes are an inherent right of the working men for the purpose of securing justice, but they must be considered a crime immediately the capitalists accept the principle of arbitration. Ways are improving and there is every possibility of a continuous improvement. But there is equal need for reducing hours of labour. The mill-hands seem to be working twelve hours or more.

The mill-owners tell me that the mill-hands are lazy, they do not give full time to their work and they are inattentive. I for one cannot expect attention and application from those who are called upon to work twelve hours per day. But I would certainly hope that when the hours are reduced to ten the labourers will put in better and almost the same amount of work as in twelve hours. Reduction in hours of labour has brought about happy results in England. When mill-hands learn to identify themselves with the interest of the mill-owners, they will rise and with them will rise the industries of our country. I would therefore urge the mill-owners to reduce the hours of labour to ten and urge the mill-hands to give as much work in ten, as they have been doing in twelve.

It is now time to examine the use we should make of the increasing wages and the hours saved. It would be like going into the frying pan out of the fire to use the increase in wages in the grog-shop and the hours saved from the gambling den. The money received, it is clear, should be devoted to education of our children, and the

time saved to our education. In both these matters the mill-owners can render much assistance. They can open cheap restaurants for the working men where they can get pure milk and wholesome refreshments. They can open reading-rooms and provide harmless amusements and games for them. Provided such healthy surroundings, the craving for drink and gambling will leave them. The Unions also should attempt similar things. They will be better employed in dividing means of improvement from within than in fighting the capitalists.

It is a sign of national degradation when little children are removed from schools and are employed in earning wages. No nation worthy of the name can possibly afford so to misuse her children. At least up to the age of sixteen they must be kept in schools. Similarly women also must be gradually weaned from mill-labour. If man and woman are partners in life and complementary each of the other, they become good householders only by dividing their labour, and a wise mother finds her time fully occupied in looking after her household and children. But where both husband and wife have to labour for mere maintenance, the nation must become degraded. It is like a bankrupt living on his capital.

And just as it is necessary for the labourers to develop their minds by receiving education and to educate their children, so it is necessary to develop the moral faculty in them. Development of the moral faculty means that of the religious sense. The world does not quarrel with those who have a true faith in God and who understand the true nature of religion. And if it does, such men turn away the wrath of their adversaries by their gentleness. Religion here does not mean merely offering one's *namaz* or going to the temple. But it means knowledge

of one's self and knowledge of God, and just as a person does not become a weaver unless he knows the art of weaving so does he fail to know himself unless he complies with certain rules. Chief amongst these are three that are of universal observance. The first is observance of Truth. He who does not know what it is to speak the truth is like a false coin valueless. The second is not to injure others. He who injures others, is jealous of others, is not fit to live in the world. For the world is at war with him, and he has to live in perpetual fear of the world. We all are bound by the tie of love. There is in everything a centripetal force without which nothing could have existed. Scientists tell us that without the presence of the cohesive force amongst the atoms that comprise this globe of ours, it would crumble to pieces and we would cease to exist, and even as there is cohesive force in blind matter, so much must there be in all things animate and the name for that cohesive force among animate beings is Love. We notice it between father and son, between brother and sister, friend and friend. But we have to learn to use that force among all that lives, and in the use of it consists our knowledge of God. Where there is love there is life; hatred leads to destruction. I hope that Anasuya bai will help you to learn this great law of Love and I ask you if you recognise her love towards you to reciprocate it by feeling in your own persons that same love towards the whole of humanity. The third rule is that we have to conquer our passions. It is called *Brahmacharya* in Sanskrit. I do not use it here merely in its accepted narrow sense. He is not a *Brahmachari,* who, although he may be a celebate or may be living a chaste life as a married man, otherwise gives himself up to a variety of indulgences. He alone is capable of knowing himself

ete subjection all his passions. restraint in its widest sense is also an of faith, a true Hindu or a true

s a breach of ' ahmacharya to hear questionable nguage or obscen 1921s. It is licentiousness of the ongue to utter fo use instead of reciting the name of God, and so wi he other senses. He alone can be considered the tr man who having subjected his passions becomes perfectly self-restrained. We are like a rider who cannot keep his horse under control and is quickly brought down. But one who drawing in the reins keeps the animal under subjection stands a fair chance of reaching his destination. Even so does a man who can control his passions make for the goal. He alone is fit for *swarajya*. He alone is a seeker after truth. He alone becomes capable of knowing God. It is my earnest wish that you will not reject these remarks as if they were copybook maxims. I ask you to believe that we shall never go forward until we have learnt the value of observing these truths. What I have told you is a fragment of my own experiences. My service of you is due simply to my love for you and I partake of your sorrows, because I hope thereby to justify myself before my Maker. What though your wages were quadrupled and you had to work only a quarter of the time you are doing now, if notwithstanding, you did not know the value of true speech, if Rakshasa in you injured others and gave the reins to your passions. We must have more wages, we must have less work, because we want clean houses, clean bodies, clean minds and a clean soul, d we strive for better wages and less work in the belief both are essential for this fourfold cleanliness. But object to be achieved, it would be a

sin to attempt and get better wa
of labour. May God grant you
power to achieve the end.

16th February,

STRIKES

(By M. K. GAND

Strikes are the order of the day. They are a symptom of the existing unrest. All kinds of vague ideas are floating in the air. A vague hope inspires all, and great will be the disappointment if that vague hope does not take definite shape. The labour world in India, as elsewhere, is at the mercy of those who set up as advisers and guides. The latter are not always scrupulous, and not always wise even when they are scrupulous. The labourers are dissatisfied with their lot. They have every reason for dissatisfaction. They are being taught, and justly, to regard themselves as being chiefly instrumental in enriching their employers. And so it requires little effort to make them lay down their tools. The political situation too is beginning to affect the labourers of India.* And there are not wanting labour leaders who consider that strikes may be engineered for political purposes.

*As a sign of labour's awakening and patriotism the following from *Young India* of 11th August, 1921, may be read with interest:

Labourers' Mite—The public have no idea of the part labourers have played in contributing to the Tilak Swaraj Fund. Twenty one thousand mill-hands of Ahmedabad have paid nearly Rs. 54,000 to the Fund and this at the prescribed rate, *i. e.* one tenth of their month wages. Seven thousand have become members. Similarly though so scientifically or largely as the Ahmedabad lab the Bo labourers have also sent their purses unask

…ll be a most serious mistake to …trikes for such a purpose. I dont …ikes can serve political ends. But … fall within the plan of non-violent Non-co-…ation. It does not require much effort of the …tellect to perceive that it is a most dangerous thing to make political use of labour until labourers understand the political condition of the country and are prepared to work for the common good.* This

*Regarding sympathetic strikes and the use of strikes as a political weapon, the following from *Young India* of 22nd September, 1921, will be read with interest:

Of Strikes—The Assam Bengal Railway and the steamer strikes were out of the ordinary, the first attempt as I have found, to have strikes out of sympathy for those outside labour unions. The strikes were therefore sympathetic, humanitarian or political. I had the pleasure of meeting the strikers all over the railway line, but specially at Gauhati, Chittagong and Barisal. Having talked to them freely, have come to the conclusion, that the people did not fully realise the cost of their undertaking. But having embarked on the strike, they have endeavoured to suffer the consequence. It is always dangerous and uncharitable for an outsider to say, what he would have done if he had the handling of a situation. But if one may hazard an opinion, I think that the labourers were not ready for a philanthropic strike. In my opinion, the labourers and artisans of India have not yet arrived at that degree of national consciousness, which is necessary for successful sympathetic strikes. The fault is ours. We who have interested ourselves in national service, have not until recently studied the wants and aspirations of these classes, nor taken

---

times. As the labourers become more organised and think of the country as well as themselves, they will fight for a due adjustment of prices of manufactures to the making of which they contribute so much labour. And then there will be no question of mills charging exorbitant prices just to swell the shareholders' dividends irrespective of the interests of the working man or the consumer. A time must come, …d the sooner the better, when there would be a respectable propor-…een dividends, wages and prices.

is hardly to be expected of
and until they have bettered then
to enable them to keep body and

---

the trouble of informing them of the political situation. W
hitherto believed, that only those who had passed through high sc
and colleges were fit to take part in national work. It is hardly therefore proper to expect the labouring and the artisan class all of a sudden to appreciate, and sacrifice themselves for interests outside their own. We may not exploit them for political or any other ends. The best service we can render them and take from them at the present stage is to teach them self-help, to give them an idea of their own duties and rights, and put them in a position to secure redress of their own just grievances. Then and not till then are they ready for political, national or humanitarian service.

Any premature precipitation of sympathetic strikes must therefore result in infinite harm to our cause. In the programme of non-violence, we must rigidly exclude the idea of gaining anything by embarrassing the Government. If our activity is pure and that of the Government impure, the latter is embarrassed by our purity, if it does not itself become pure. Thus, a movement of purification benefits both parties. Whereas a movement of mere destruction leaves the destroyer unpurified, and brings him down to the level of those whom he seeks to destroy.

Even our sympathetic strikes therefore have to be strikes of self-purification, *i. e.* Non-co-operation. And so, when we declare a strike to redress a wrong, we really cease to take part in the wrong, and thus leave the wrong-doer to his own resources, in other words enable him to see the folly of continuing the wrong. Such a strike can only succeed, when behind it is the fixed determination not to revert to service.

Speaking, therefore, as one having handled large successful strikes, I repeat the following maxims, already stated in these pages, for the guidance of all strike leaders:

(1) There should be no strike without a real grievance.

(2) There should be no strike, if the persons concerned are not able to support themselves out of their own savings or by engaging in some temporary occupation, such as carding, spinning and weaving Strikers should never depend upon public subscriptions or charity.

decent manner. The greatest political contribution, therefore, that labourers can make is to improve their own condition, to become better informed, to insist on their rights, and even to demand proper use by their employers of the manufactures in which they have had such an important hand. The proper evolution, therefore, would be for the labourers to raise themselves to the status of part proprietors. Strikes, therefore, for

---

(3) Strikers must fix an unalterable minimum demand, and declare it before embarking upon their strike.

A strike may fail in spite of a just grievance and the ability of strikers to hold out indefinitely, if there are workers to replace them. A wise man, therefore, will not strike for increase of wages or other comforts, if he feels that he can be easily replaced. But a philanthropic or patriotic man will strike in spite of supply being greater than the demand, when he feels for and wishes to associate himself with his neighbour's distress. Needless to say, there is no room in a civil strike of the nature described by me for violence in the shape of intimidation, incendiarism or otherwise. I should therefore be extremely sorry to find, that the recent derailment near Chittagong was due to mischief done by any of the strikers. Judged by the tests suggested by me, it is clear that friends of the strikers should never have advised them to apply for or receive Congress or any other public funds for their support. The value of the strikers' sympathy was diminished to the extent, that they received or accepted financial aid. The merit of a sympathetic strike lies in the inconvenience and the loss suffered by the sympathisers.

As to what should be done now for or by the strikers, who have in spite of threats and temptations manfully held out—and they are more than 50 p. c.—I have already given my opinion to the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee. And by that I wish to abide. If the strikers struck on the sole issue of sympathy for the outraged coolies at Chandpur and without intimidating their brethern, they had every moral right to do so, and they showed an unexpected measure of partiotism and fellow-feeling. I hope that they will refuse to rejoin service, until the Government have fully and frankly apologised, and refunded to the parties concerned the monies paid for the repatriation of the coolies.

the present should only take place for the direct betterment of the labourers' lot, and, when they have acquired the spirit of patriotism, for the regulation of prices of their manufactures.

The conditions of a successful strike are simple.* And when they are fulfilled, a strike need never fail.

(1) The cause of the strike must be just.

(2) There should be practical unanimity among the strikers.

(3) There should be no violence used against non-strikers.

(4) Strikers should be able to maintain themselves

* Strikes should not mean absence of discipline or resort to lightning strike. The following appeared in *Young India* of 1st December, 1921:

Strikes—When *Hartal* takes place what should mill hands and other employees do who cannot get leave from their unsympathetic or alien employers? In terms of non-violence there can be but one answer. An employee who gives himself leave uses violence, for he commits a criminal breach of the contract of his service. He cannot absent himself without the permission of his employer. All he can do is to resign if he is not satisfied with his employer. But this too a body of employees may not do all of a sudden. For they may not in order to enforce their political opinion threaten to leave without due notice. In short, mill hands and such other employees should not be encouraged to coerce their employers into giving leave. Non-violent action is not quite so simple as one may imagine. I have heard men describing as Non-violent the holding tight of the legs of persons proceeding to drink-shops. Similarly youngsters have classed foul abuse of liquor dealers among Non-violent acts. This is merely playing with language and bore bitter fruit in Bombay. We must be true to ourselves if we wish to give Non-violence a fair trial. Even if we cannot make our thought Non-violent, we must so regulate our speech and action as to make them completely innocuous. If we find it impossible or too difficult to practise, we must give up the attempt but we must not blame one of the greatest doctrines of life for our incapacity. If failure has to be written against us, it won't be failure of Non-violence but of the violent to respond to it.

during the strike period without falling back upon Union funds and should therefore occupy themselves in some useful and productive temporary occupation.

(5) A strike is no remedy when there is enough other labour to replace strikers. In that case, in the event of unjust treatment or inadequate wages or the like, resignation is the remedy.

(6) Successful strikes have taken place even when all the above conditions have not been fulfilled, but that merely proves that the employees were weak and have a guilty conscience. We often make terrible mistakes by copying bad examples. The safest thing is not to copy examples of which we have rarely complete knowledge but to follow the conditions which we know and recognise to be essential for success.

It is the duty of every well wisher of the country, if we are to attain Swaraj during the year, not to precipitate any action that may even by a day retard the fulfilment of the great national purpose.

9th March, 1921

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE PEASANTS OF THE UNITED PROVINCES

We give below a free rendering of the Hindi instructions addressed by Mr. Gandhi to the peasants of the United Provinces during his visit to Oudh.* Pundit

* The following appeared in *Young India* of 18th May, 1921:

The Zamindars and the Ryots.—Whilst the U. P. Government is crossing the bounds of propriety, and intimidating people, there is little doubt that the Kisans too are not making wise use of their newly found power. In several Zamindaries, they are said to have overstepped the mark, taken the law into their own hands and to have become impatient of anybody who would not do as they wish. They

Motilal Nehru, in his capacity as president of the Kisan Sabha, has distributed them in thousands among the peasantry.

Attainment of Swaraj or redress of grievances is impossible unless the following rules are strictly observed.

1. We may not hurt anybody. We may not use our sticks against anybody. We may not use abusive language or exercise any other undue pressure.

2. We may not loot shops.

3. We should influence our opponents by kindness, not by using physical force nor stopping their water supply nor the services of the barber and the washerman.

4. We may not withhold taxes from the Government or rent from the landlord.

5. Should there be any grievances against zamin-

---

are abusing social boycott and are turning it into an instrument of violence. They are reported to have stopped the supply of water, barber, and other paid services to their Zemindars in some instances and even suspended payment of the rent due to them. The Kisan movement has received an impetus from Non-co-operation but it is anterior to and independent of it. Whilst we will not hesitate to advise the Kisans when the moment comes, to suspend payment of taxes to the Government, it is not contemplated that at any stage of Non-co-operation we would seek to deprive the Zamindars of their rent. The Kisan movement must be confined to the improvement of status of the Kisans and the betterment of the relations between the Zamindars and them. The Kisans must be advised scrupulously to abide by the terms of their agreement with the Zamindars, whether such is written or inferred from custom. Where a custom or even a written contract is bad, they may not try to uproot it by violence or without previous reference to the Zamindars. In every case there should be a friendly discussion with the Zamindars and an attempt made to arrive at a settlement. Our capacity for Swaraj depends upon our capacity for solving without reference to, or intervention of, the Government, all the varied and complex problems that must arise in the affairs of one of the biggest and the most ancient nations like ours.

dars, they should be reported to Pundit Motilal Nehru and his advice followed.

6. It should be borne in mind that we want to turn Zamindars into friends.

7. We are not at the present moment offering civil disobedience; we should, therefore, carry out all Government orders.

8. We may not stop railway trains nor forcibly enter them without tickets.

9. In the event of any of our leaders being arrested, we may not prevent his arrest nor create any disturbance. We shall not lose our cause by the Government arresting our leaders, we shall certainly lose it if we become mad and do violence.

10. We must abolish intoxicating drinks, drugs and other evil habits.

11. We must treat all women as mothers and sisters and respect and protect them.

12. We must promote unity between Hindus and Muslims.

13. As amongst Hindus we may not regard any one as inferior or untouchable. There should be the spirit of equality and brotherhood among all. We should regard all the inhabitants of India as brothers and sisters.

14. We may not indulge in gambling.

15. We may not steal.

16. We may not tell an untruth on any account whatsoever. We should be truthful in all our dealings.

17. We should introduce the spinning wheel in every home and all—male and female—should devote their spare time to spinning. Boys and girls should also be taught and encouraged to spin for four hours daily.

18. We should avoid the use of all foreign cloth

and wear cloth woven by the weavers from yarn spun by ourselves.

19. We should not resort to law courts but should have all disputes settled by private arbitration.

The most important thing to remember is to curb anger, never to do violence and even to suffer violence done to us.

8th June, 1921

THE ASSAM COOLIES

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

I have purposely refrained from dealing with this trouble, though I have remained in touch with Mr. Andrews and others, who are on the spot dealing with it. I refer to the trouble only to state that I knew nothing of its coming. I should be sorry, if anybody used my name to lead the men to desert their employers. It is clear enough that it is purely a labour trouble. It is admitted that the employers reduced the wages. Both Mr. Das and Mr. Andrews report that the trouble is purely economic,* and that the coolies have a substantial grievance. It is evident that the reformed Government has failed to cope with it. I observe that the *Times of India* has made the most illegitimate use of the trouble to impute enmity to English commercial interests in India. It has become the fashion to attribute hatred to Non-co-operators. I make bold to say that Non-co-operation has alone prevented racial feuds and disturbances, and directed the anger of the people in the

*Mr. Andrews' detailed survey of the situation appeared in the *Modern Review* wherein he dwells on the oppression of the poor consequent on Assam troubles.

proper channel. The aim of Non-co-operation is to hurt no interest whatsoever, by reason only of its belonging to a race. Its aim is to purge every interest of its injurious or impure character. Every English or Indian interest that is based on injustice or brute force, or is antagonistic to the growth of India as a whole, is undoubtedly in peril. No interest that is supported merely by brute force but not by people's goodwill, can possibly survive the fire of Non-co-operation. If the Assam planters are not sustained by the exploitation of Indian labour, they have nothing to fear. A time is certainly coming, when there will be no more unconscionable dividends. The profits of big concerns must bear relation to the wages of the workers. I lay down these categorical propositions, because I know that Non-co-operation is beyond the reach of the bayonet. It has found an abiding place in the Indian heart. Workers like me will go when the hour has struck, but Non-co-operation will remain. I am aware, too, that the labouring class in India has not yet become enlightened enough to have the ability to regulate the relations between capital and labour on a just basis. But that time is coming soon,—faster than we may imagine. I am hoping that the capitalists, be they European or Indian, will appreciate the new awakening, and the new force that has arisen in our midst.

21st July, 1921

THE SHADOW OF SIMLA

(By M. K. Gandhi)

If proof were wanted that the movement of Non-co-operation is neither anti-British nor anti-Christian, we

have the instance of Mr. Stokes, a nationalised British subject and staunch Christian, devoting his all to the eradication of the evil of Begar. Mr. Stokes is a convinced Non-co-operator and Congressman. I think I am right in saying, that he has come to it by slow degrees. No Indian is giving such battle to the Government as Mr. Stokes. He has veritably become the guide, philosopher and friend of the hillmen. The reader should know that Begar is going on under the shadow of Simla, under the Viceroy's nose as it were. And yet Lord Reading is powerless to remedy the mischief. I have no doubt, that he is willing enough. But he cannot carry the district officers and others with him. And some of the officials are so unscrupulous that, if they cannot have their way in the territories directly administered, they do so through the native states. Now, on the hills near Simla there are small native states in which the British officer is all-powerful, more so in his own jurisdiction than the Viceroy. He can make the states do as he wills, and yet profess to be unconnected with their doings. There is one such state under the Court of Wards. And it is here, that through the influence of the Deputy Commissioner of Simla, repression is going on in order to suppress the Begar movement. The chosen way, which as a Parsi friend corrected me dates not from British days but from Adam's, is to lop off tall poppies. The axe must be laid at the root. And so the most efficient and cultured of the poor hillmen, named Kapur Singh, has been put under lock and key. Here is a graphic description of the way evidence was collected. 'People were subjected to a reign of terror. The Simla Police were brought, a number of them arrested all the people scared by threats of machine-guns and Kala-pani. . . It was in such an atmosphere, that the evi-

dence for the prosecution was collected.' This reminds one of the Punjab martial law days.

Naturally the hillmen feel sore about this persecution of their trusted leader. I hope that, under Mr. Stokes' inspiration, they will resolutely refuse to do any Begar at all even for full value, until their leader is discharged. They must not weaken, but must invite upon their devoted heads the wrath of the authorities, and face imprisonment even as he did.

Why this persistence in exacting Begar? For the authority, the influence and the comfort of the officials and officers depend upon the continuance of Begar. Without it, they cannot sport and kill wild beasts in the forests of the Himalayas. The Duke could not have been taken for *shikar* to the mountain fastnesses, if Begar had gone out of use. For the doubtful pleasure of shooting tigers and innocent 'game,' a way had to be cut by impressing the labours of thousands of unwilling villagers. If the beasts had intelligent speech at their command, they would state a case against man that would stagger 'humanity.' I can understand the shooting of wild beasts which come to annoy us. But I have found no cogent reasons advanced for wasting treasures upon organising parties for satisfying man's thirst for blood. And yet, if there was no Begar, there would be no 'sport' for the officer or the globetrotter. I need not have the practice of Indian princes and precedents from the Mahabharata flung in my face. I decline to be slave to precedents or practice I cannot understand or defend on a moral basis.

21st July, 1921

POSITION OF WOMEN

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Shrimati Saraladevi of Katak writes :—" Don't you admit that the treatment of women is as bad a disease as untouchability itself? The attitude of the young 'nationalists' I have come in contact with, is beastly in ninety cases out of a hundred. How many of the Non-co-operators in India do not regard women as objects of enjoyment? Is that essential condition of success—self-purification—possible without a change of attitude towards women?"

I am unable to subscribe that the treatment of women is a 'disease as bad as untouchability.' Shrimati Saraladevi has grossly exaggerated the evil. Nor can the charge levelled against the Non-co-operators of mere gratification of lust be sustained. A cause can only lose by exaggeration. At the same time, I have no difficulty about subscribing to the proposition, that in order to fit ourselves for true Swaraj, men must cultivate much greater respect than they have for woman and her purity. Mr. Andrews has struck a much truer note than this lady, when he tells us in burning language that we dare not gloat over the shame of our fallen sisters. That any Non-co-operator could have been found willing to relate with gusto that there were some of these erring sisters who reserved themselves for Non-co-operators, is a degrading thought. There can be no distinction between co-operators and Non-co-operators in this matter of vital importance for our moral well-being. All of us men must hang our heads in shame, so long as there is a single woman whom we dedicate to our lust. I will far rather see the race of man extinct,

than that we should become less than beasts by making the noblest of God's creation the object of our lust. But this is not a problem merely for India. It is a world problem. And if I preach against the modern artificial life of sensual enjoyment, and ask men and women to go back to the simple life epitomised in the charkha, I do so because I know that, without an intelligent return to simplicity, there is no escape from our descent to a state lower than brutality. I passionately desire the utmost freedom for our women. I detest child marriages. I shudder to see a child widow, and shiver with rage when a husband just widowed with brutal indifference contracts another marriage. I deplore the criminal indifference of parents who keep their daughters utterly ignorant and illiterate and bring them up only for the purpose of marrying them off to some young man of means. Notwithstanding all this grief and rage, I realise the difficulty of the problem. Women must have votes and an equal legal status. But the problem does not end there. It only commences at the point where women begin to affect the political deliberations of the nation.

To illustrate what I mean, let me relate the enchanting description a valued Mussalman friend gave me of a talk he had with a noted feminist in London. He was attending a meeting of feminists. A lady friend was surprised to find a Mussalman at such a meeting ! She inquired how he found himself there. The friend said he had two major and two minor reasons for so doing. His father died when he was an infant. He owed all he was in life to his mother. Then he was married to a woman who was a real partner in life. And he had no sons but four daughters all minors in whom as a father he was deeply interested. Was it any wonder

that he was a feminist? He went on. Mussalmans were accused of indifference to women. There never was a grosser libel uttered. The law of Islam gave equal rights to women. He thought that man for his lust had degraded woman. Instead of adoring the soul within her, he had set about adoring her body, and he had succeeded so well in his design, that woman to-day did not know that she had begun to hug her bodily adornment which was almost a sign of her slavery. He added with his voice almost choked; if it was not so, how could it be, that the fallen sisters delighted most in the embellishment of the body? Had we (men) not crushed the very soul out of them? No, he said regaining self-possession, he wanted not only the mechanical freedom for women, he wanted also to break down the shackles that bound her of her own will. And so he had intended to bring up his daughters to an independent calling.

I need not pursue the ennobling conversation any further. I want my fair correspondent to ponder over the central idea of the Mussalman friend's discourse and tackle the problem. Women must cease to consider herself the object of man's lust. The remedy is more in her hands than man's. She must refuse to adorn herself for men including her husband, if she will be an equal partner with man. I cannot imagine Sita ever wasting a single moment on pleasing Rama by physical charms.

15th September, 1921

OUR FALLEN SISTERS

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The first occasion I had of meeting those women who arn their livelihood out of their shame was at Coca-ada in the Andhra province. There it was a few moment's interview with only half a dozen of them. The second occasion was at Barisal. Over one hundred of them met by appointment. They had sent a letter in advance, asking for an interview and telling me that they had become members of the Congress and subscribed to the Tilak Swaraj Fund, but could not understand my advice not to seek office in the various Congress Committees. They wound up by saying that they wished to seek my advice as to their future welfare. The gentleman who handed me the letter did so with great hesitation, not knowing whether I would be offended or pleased with the receipt of the letter. I put him at ease by assuring him, that it was my duty to serve these sisters if I could in any way.

For me the two hours I passed with these sisters is a treasured memory. They told me that they were over 350 in the midst of a population of about 20,000 men, women and children. They represent the shame of the men of Barisal, and the sooner Barisal gets rid of it, the better for its great name. And what is true of Barisal is true, I fear, of every city. I mention Barisal, therefore, as an illustration. The credit of having thought of serving these sisters belongs to some young men of Barisal. Let me hope that Barisal will soon be able to claim the credit, too, of having eradicated the evil.

Of all the evils for which man has made himself responsible, none is so degrading, so shocking or so brutal

as his abuse of the better half of humanity to me, t female sex, not the weaker sex. It is the nobler of t. two, for it is even to-day the embodiment of sacrific silent suffering, humility, faith and knowledge. A woman's intuition has often proved truer than man' arrogant assumption of superior knowledge. There i method in putting Sita before Rama and Radha befor Krishna. Let us not delude ourselves into the belief that this gambling in vice has a place in our evolution because it is rampant and in some cases even state-regulated in civilized Europe.* Let us not also perpetuate the vice on the strength of Indian precedents.

*The following appeared in *Young India* of 18th August, 1921 :

Plague-spots of Lucknow.—An English friend writes to me at Lucknow :

"I am just writing to ask you to write a word before you go to some one in authority among your supporters here in regard to the brothels in Luckow. I was talking to the military police this morning in Aminabad, and it seems that there are some fifty of these places in that locality frequented by soldiers (some of whom have been court-martialled as it is out of bounds) Europeans and Anglo-Indians. He did not say anything about Indians, but I heard the other day that they also go to these women. A word from you as to this debasing of manhood and lack of self-control would do more than anything else to connteract this evil. I will pledge myself to do all I can to help in the matter."

I wish I could share the English friend's belief that my word has the power he attributes to it. As I write this paragraph, the picture of the dear sisters who visited me at Cocanada after night-fall haunts me. They were dearer to me after I learnt of their shame. It was only by suggestion they could tell me what their life was. As the spokeswoman spoke to me, she had shame and sorrow written in her eyes. I could not bring myself to hold them guilty. I devoted my speech after this meeting to the necessity of personal purity. My heart therefore goes out to the fallen sisters of Lucknow. They are driven to a life of shame. I am satisfied that they do not go to it from choice. And the beast in man has made the detestable crime a lucrative profession. Lucknow is noted for its love of ease. But

We should cease to grow the moment we cease to discriminate between virtue and vice, and slavishly copy the past which we do not fully know. We are proud heirs to all that was noblest and best in the by-gone age. We must not dishonour our heritage by multiplying past errors. In a self-respecting India, is not every woman's virtue as much every man's concern as his own sister's? Swaraj means ability to regard every inhabitant of India as our own brother or sister.

And so, as a man I hung my head in shame before these hundred sisters. Some were elderly, most were between twenty and thirty, and two or three were girls below twelve. Between them all, they told me, they had six girls and four boys, the eldest of whom was married to one of their own class. The girls were to be brought up to the same life as themselves, unless something else was possible. That these women should have considered their lot to be beyond repair, was like a stab in the living flesh. And yet they were intelligent and modest. Their talk was dignified, their answers were clean and straight. And for the moment their determination was as firm as that of any Satyagrahi. Eleven of them promised to give up their present life and take to spinning and weaving from the following day, if they received a

---

Lucknow is also the seat of a Musalman divine. It has its full share of all that is noble in Islam. For the Hindus Lucknow is the capital of the Province where the spotless Sita and Rama roamed and reigned. It recalls the best days of Hindu purity, nobility, bravery and steadfastness to truth. Non-co-operation is self-purification, and I urge all the non-co-operators and others to deal with this moral plague of Lucknow. I hope no custodian of Lucknow's good name will remind me that Lucknow is no worse than the other cities in India. Lucknow has come in by chance as an illustration. We are responsible throughout India for the purity and the safety of our womanhood. Why should not Lucknow lead?

helping hand. The others said they would take time to think, for they did not wish to deceive me.

Here is work for the citizens of Barisal.* Here is work for all true servants of India, men as well as women. If there are 350 unhappy sisters in a population of 20,000, there may be 52,50,000 in all India. But I flatter myself with the belief that four fifths of the population of India, which live in the villages and are purely agricultural, are not touched by the vice. The lowest figure for all India would therefore be 10,50,000 women living on the sale of their own honour. Before these unfortunate sisters could be weaned from their degradation, two conditions have to be fulfilled. We men must learn to control our passions, and these women should be found a calling that would enable them to earn

*The following appeared in *Young India* of 17th November 1921:

Fallen Sisters.—The reader will be glad to learn that the work of reclaiming the fallen sisters of Barisal has been taken up in right earnest. Dr. Rai writes, saying that many of them have been visited, and spinning is being introduced among them. Jagadish Babu who has been in charge of Babu Ashvinikumar Dutt's school for years has promised to guide the young workers who have undertaken this responsible service. I hope that those who have taken up this much-needed service will not leave it half finished. They must be prepared for disappointments, they must expect slow progress. It is only in such work that is free from excitement or immediate promise of renown that one's love of service for its own sake is tested. I commend the example of Barisal to the other cities also. This purifying work has to be done even after Swaraj. Not every one is qualified for it. Those therefore who feel the call and have the requisite purity should turn their attention to the eradication of this growing vice. The movement naturally has two branches, the reclamation of fallen sisters and the weaning of men from the degrading vice which makes man look upon his sister with lust and tempts him to make her a prey to it. The qualities required for both the branches of work are the same, and the work should be simultaneously done in both the branches if it is to bear fruit.

an honourable living. The movement of Non-co-operation is nothing, if it does not purify us and restrain our evil passions. And there is no occupation but spinning and weaving which all can take up without over crowding. These sisters, the vast majority of them, need not think of marriage. They agreed that they could not. They must therefore become the true *Sannyasinis* of India. Having no cares of life but of service, they can spin and weave to their heart's content. One million fifty thousand women diligently weaving every day for eight hours means that number of rupees per day for an impoverished India. These sisters told me they earned as much as two rupees per day. But then they admitted, that they had many things needed to pander to man's lust, which they could discard when they took to spinning and weaving, reverting to a natural life. By the time I had finished with my interviews, they knew without my telling them, why they could not be office-bearers in Congress Committees if they did not give up their sinfulness. None could officiate at the altar of Swaraj, who did not approach it with pure hands and a pure heart.

11th August, 1921

TO THE WOMEN OF INDIA

Dear Sisters,

The All-India Congress Committee has come to a momentous decision in fixing the 30th September next as the final date for completing the boycott of foreign cloth begun by the sacrificial fire lit on the 31st July in Bombay in memory of Lokamanya Tilak. It was accorded the privilege of setting fire to the huge pile

containing costly sadis and other dresses which you have hitherto considered fine and beautiful. I feel that it was right and wise on the part of the sisters who gave their costly clothing. Its destruction was the most economical use you could have made of it, even as destruction of plague-infected articles is their most economical and best use. It was a necessary surgical operation designed to avert more serious complaints in the body politic.

The women of India have during the past twelve months worked wonders on behalf of the motherland.* You have silently worked away as angels of mercy. You have parted with your cash and your fine jewellery.

*The following appeared in *Young India* of 22nd December, 1920:

Behold the Woman.—We may learn much from the women of India. I wish the Englishmen as well as our own unbelievers in the efficacy or the necessity of Non-co-operation were to witness the demonstration of the women of India in favour of Non-co-operation. Everywhere they have flocked in their hundreds and thousands. They have even come out of their Purdahs and given Maulana Shaukat Ali and me their blessings. They have instinctively understood the purity of the movement. Their hearts have been touched. They have given up their pearl and diamond bangles, their necklaces and their rings. All have come—both rich and poor—and given us their blessings and accompanied them with rich gifts, rich because of the absolutely voluntary nature thereof. They have understood, too, that the purity of the poor women of India is hidden in the music of the spinning wheel. They do not flock to the standard of Non-co-operation through hatred.

The other side—But the men are impatient and grievously err as they are reported to have done at Delhi and in Bengal. It was cruel and sinful to deny the rights of burial to the corpse of a man whom the so-called Non-co-operators (if they were Non-co-operators) disliked. It was filthy to throw, at a place in East Bengal, night soil on a candidate who had stood for election as a council member, or to cut the ears of a voter for daring to exercise his vote. These are just the ways of defeating our own purpose. Non-co-operation is non-violent not merely in regard to the Englishmen and government

You have wandered from house to house to make collections. Some of you have even assisted in picketing. Some of you who were used to fine dresses of variegated colours and had a number of changes during the day, have now adopted the white and spotless, but heavy Khadi sadi reminding one of a woman's innate purity. You have done all this for the sake of India, for the sake of the Khilafat, for the sake of the Punjab. There is no guile about your word or work. Yours is the purest sacrifice untainted by anger or hate. Let me confess to you that your spontaneous and loving response all over India has convinced me that God is with us. No other proof of our struggle being one of self-purification is needed than that lacs of India's women are actively helping it.

Having given much, more is now required of you. Men bore the principal share of the subscriptions to the Tilak Swaraj Fund. But completion of the Swadeshi programme is possible only if you give the largest share. Boycott is impossible, *unless you will surrender the whole of your foreign clothing.** So long as

* *Of Tamil Women.*—A friend writes from Tirupati:

"The greatest obstacle in the way of success of our movement in Madras are our women. Some of them are very reactionary and a very large number of the high class Brahmin ladies have become addicted to many of the western vices. They drink coffee not less than three times a day and consider it very fashionable to drink more. In dress they are no better, they have given up the homely cheap cloth and are running after costly foreign cloth. In the matter of jewels,

---

officials. It has to be equally so as between ourselves. A co-operator is as much entitled to freedom of action, speech and thought as the tallest among Non-co-operators. Non-co-operation is directed against all slavery. Every Non-co-operator therefore retards the function of his cause by resorting to violence. It is a sure sign of want of faith in his mission.

the taste persists, so long is complete renunciation impossible. And boycott means complete renunciation. We must be prepared to be satisfied with such cloth as

---

Brahmin ladies excel all others. Among Brahmins, Shri Vaishnava ladies are the worst sinners. When men are trying to return to a purer life, our ladies are becoming extravagant. While going to temples to worship God, they cannot think of a plain, simple dress. They should wear the costliest jewels available and still more costly laces. I know of many honest women, who refuse to go to temples because they have not got rich clothes and costly jewels."

I am loth to think that what the friend who is himself a Non-co-operating Vaishnava pleader says is all true. And I am inclined to disbelieve the statement that the Tamil sisters are worse than the rest in the matter of love of gaudiness. All the same, his letter ought to serve as a warning to the Tamil sisters. They must revert to the original simplicity and certainly God will be better pleased with those who wear the spotless Khadi sadi as a symbol of the inner purity than with those who are gaudily dressed. Our temples are not meant for show but for expression of humility and simplicity which are typical of a devotional mood. There should be a continuous propaganda amongst women in the Madras Presidency with reference to the evil complained of.

The following appeared in *Young India* of 25th August, 1921 :

Tamil Sisters again.—A South Indian lawyer sends me the following note:

"*Khadi* is not as widely used in the Tamil province as in the other provinces, mainly because the women-folk do not wear it. The spinning-wheel is not much in evidence for the same reason. Plain white cannot be worn by married women here. They can only wear dyed *sadis*. In former times cotton was the only wear of ladies. Now except by the poorest, cotton *sadis* are discarded, and silk *sadis* form the daily wear. Silk *sadis* were at first locally manufactured at Koranadu (near Mayavaram) and later on at Conjeevaram, and dyed with Indian dyes. They cost from Rs. 10 to 30. They were only occasionally used. Lately the market has been exclusively captured by Bangalore *sadis* dyed with German or English dyes, the least of which costs about Rs. 50. This presses on the poor Brahman householder, specially as he has to clothe the members of his family only with these; and when it is the daily wear, he has to go in for a number of

India can produce, even as we are thankfully content with such children as God gives us. I have not known a mother throwing away her baby even though it may appear ugly to an outsider. So should it be with the patriotic women of India about Indian manufactures. And for you only hand-spun and hand woven can be

---

them. On marriage occasions the minimum cost of a *sadi* fit for presentation is above Rs. 100. Many a decent family is ruined by a marriage, mostly on this account. This ruinous habit, which was confined to the Brahmans, has spread among other classes also.

"Besides the question of expense, there is the other aspect of comfort and convenience. Silk is non-absorbing and heavy, and working or cooking in it is martyrdom. It is always hot here except for one or two months of the year. There is also the peculiar insanitary habit of not washing the more costly *sadis* lest they should lose colour and get crimpled. The perspiration and smell emitted are awful.

"Many a householder on the verge of ruin would feel grateful to you if you would bring about a return to economy, simplicity and comfort."

I hope the workers in Madras will deal with the evil complained of in the correspondent's letter. I dread my forthcoming visit to Madras. I share the correspondent's feeling that the Tamil woman is over-fond of her silk *sadi*. There is no more unwholesome garment than silk in a hot climate like that of Madras. And one hundred rupees for a *sadi* is a criminal waste of money in a poor country like India. Men are no better, for they are proud of their handwoven *pugris*, *dhotis* and *uparnas*, little thinking that the yarn used for these things is all foreign. Strange as it may appear, absorbent *Khadi* is cooler than the fine garments which are so prized by men. I am hoping, however, that my faith in the spirituality of Tamilians will be realised even in the difficult matter of Swadeshi, and that they will perceive the spiritual necessity of complete renunciation of foreign cloth and return to the *Charkha*. In the melting plains of Madras and Andhra, I can imagine no industry so helpful as the gentle-moving *Charkha*. Dravida land is responsible for sending out the largest number of emigrants to a life of servility and exile. Restoration of the *Charkha* automatically solves that difficult problem of enforced emigration. Land alone cannot support the poor peasantry of India even if there was no assessment to be paid.

regarded as Indian manufactures. During the transition stage you can only get coarse Khadi in abundance. You may add all the art to it that your taste allows or requires. And if you will be satisfied with coarse Khadi for a few months, India need not despair of seeing a revival of the fine rich and coloured garments of old which were once the envy and the despair of the world. I assure you that a six months' course of self-denial will show you that what we to-day regard as artistic is only falsely so, and that true art takes note not merely of form but also of what lies behind. There is an art that kills and an art that gives life. The fine fabric that we have imported from the West or the far East has literally killed millions of our brothers and sisters, and delivered thousands of our dear sisters to a life of shame. True art must be evidence of happiness, contentment and purity of its authors. And if you will have such art revived in our midst, the use of Khadi is obligatory on the best of you at the present moment.

And not only is the use of Khadi necessary for the success of the Swadeshi programme, but it is imperative for every one of you to spin during your leisure hours. I have suggested to boys and men also that they should spin. Thousands of them, I know, are spinning daily. But the main burden of spinning must, as of old, fall on your shoulders. Two hundred years ago, the women of India spun not only for home demand but also for foreign lands. They spun not merely coarse counts but the finest that the world has ever spun. No machine has yet reached the fineness of the yarn spun by our ancestors. If then we are to cope with the demand for Khadi during the two months and afterwards, you must form spinning-clubs, institute spinning competitions and flood the Indian market with handspun yarn. For this

purpose some of you have to become experts in spinning, carding and adjusting the spinning-wheels. This means ceaseless toil. You will not look upon spinning as a means of livelihood. For the middle class it should supplement the income of the family, and for very poor women, it is undoubtedly a means of livelihood. The spinning-wheel should be as it was the widow's loving companion. But for you who will read this appeal, it is presented as a duty, as *Dharma*. If all the well-to-do women of India were to spin a certain quantity daily, they would make yarn cheap and bring about much more quickly than otherwise the required fineness.

The economic and the moral salvation of India thus rests mainly with you. The future of India lies on your knees, for you will nurture the future generation. You can bring up the children of India to become simple, God-fearing and brave men and women, or you can coddle them to be weaklings unfit to brave the storms of life and used to foreign fineries which they would find it difficult in after life to discard. The next few weeks will show of what stuff the women of India are made. I have not the shadow of a doubt as to your choice. The destiny of India is far safer in your hands than in the hands of a Government that has so exploited India's resources that she has lost faith in herself. At every one of women's meetings, I have asked for your blessings for the national effort, and I have done so in the belief that you are pure, simple and godly enough to give them with effect. You can ensure the fruitfulness of your blessings by giving up your foreign cloth and during your spare hours by ceaselessly spinning for the nation.

I remain,
Your devoted brother,
M. K. GANDHI.

15th December, 1921

WOMEN'S PART

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The women of Calcutta have obstructed the gentlemen of Calcutta by trying to sell *Khadi* and a telegram in the newspapers has announced that they have been consequently arrested. The company includes the devoted partner of the President elect, his widowed sister and his niece. I had hoped that in the initial stages at any rate women would be spared the honour of going to gaol. They were not to become aggressive civil resisters. But the Bengal Government, in their impartial zeal to make no distinction even of sex, have conferred the honour upon three women of Calcutta. I hope that the whole country will welcome this innovation. The women of India should have as much share in winning Swaraj as men. Probably in this peaceful struggle, woman can outdistance man by many a mile. We know that she is any day superior to man in her religious devotion. Silent and dignified suffering is the badge of her sex. And now that the Government of Bengal have dragged the woman into the line of fire, I hope that the women all over India will take up the challenge and organise themselves. In any case they were bound, when a sufficient number of men had been removed, for the honour of their sex to step into their places. But now let it be side by side with men in sharing the hardships of gaol life. God will protect their honour. When as if to mock man her natural protectors became helpless to prevent Draupadi from being denuded of her last piece of cloth, the power of her own virtue preserved her honour. And so will it be to the end of time. Even the weakest physically have

been given the ability to protect their own honour. Let it be man's privilege to protect woman, but let no woman of India feel helpless in the absence of man or in the event of his failing to perform the sacred duty of protecting her. One who knows how to die need never fear any harm to her or his honour.

I would suggest to the women of India quietly but without loss of time to collect names of those who are ready to enter the line of fire.* Let them send their offer to the women of Bengal and let the latter feel that their sisters elsewhere are ready to follow their noble example. It is likely that there will not be many forthcoming to brave the risks of a gaol life and all it must mean to

* The following is from *Young India* of 22nd December, 1921:

Selling Khadi.—The lead given by Shrimatis Vasantidevi Das and Urmiladevi in selling *Khadi* from house to house and hawking it in streets has been quickly taken up in the other parts of the country. Shrimati Sarala Devi writes, "I have to go immediately to the city to arrange to send 40 ladies in 20 groups under two volunteers each to sell *Khadi* in 20 lanes." In Madras too they are organising similarly. I cannot conceive any better occupation for ladies especially besides hand spinning than popularising *Khadi* by hawking it themselves. It is fine training in throwing off false pride or false modesty. And it is a most harmless challenge to the police to arrest them if they dare. But if the practice is to become common, it must be regulated by grown up ladies of position and without any bluster. Needless to say, there should be no undue pressure put upon the public to buy. We must not sicken them. Our business is merely to take this most useful national ware to their doors and give them the choice of buying or rejecting it.

The following appeared in *Young India* of 28th July, 1921:

Women as Pickets.—A Parsi sister writes to say that when picketing is recommenced in Bombay, she is quite prepared to join any party that may be raised and she hopes that many other sisters will come forward. She is of opinion that if women respond in large numbers, their presence will be an effective check on violence. I entirely endorse her remarks, and hope that many other sisters will send in their names to the Committee at Bombay as candidates.

women. The nation will have no cause to be ashamed, if only a few offer themselves for sacrifice in the first instance.

Men's duty is clear. We must not lose our heads. Excitement will not protect our women or our country. We have asked Government neither to spare women nor children. It certainly did not in the Punjab, during those martial law days. I consider it decidedly more civilized that the officials in Calcutta should on a legal pretence arrest our sisters in Calcutta for what they consider is a crime than that a Bosworth Smith in the Punjab should spit upon, swear at and otherwise humiliate the women of Manianwala. We did not offer our women to be insulted thuswise. But we do offer our women for imprisonment if they will arrest them in the prosecution of public service. We must not expect the Government to look on with indifference, whilst the women are spreading the gospel of Swadeshi and undermining the very basis of its existence,—its traffic in foreign cloth and the consequent ability to exploit India's resources. If, therefore, we, men, allow our sisters to take part in the Swadeshi agitation, we must concede the right of the Government to imprison them equally with men.

We must therefore control our anger. It will be cowardly to challenge a duel and then swear at the adversary for taking up the challenge. Men must fill the gaols. Men must prove to the Government that the awakening is not confined to a few men, but it has permeated the masses, that the spirit of non-violence possesses not merely a select number, but that it possesses the best part of India. We must show by our conduct that the sudden eruption was an exception and not a symptom of a general disease. And now, when

the cause for irritation is almost the greatest, is the time for showing the greatest forbearance and self-restraint. I modify the adjective by using an adverb before it. For I do not think that the greatest irritation has yet been offered. I can conceive occasions which may cause irritation to the straining point. If we are to gain freedom and vindicate the honour of the Khilafat and the Punjab, we must pay a much higher price and not lose equanimity in the midst of the greatest possible irritation. Let us prepare for the worst and give credit to the Government for decency by expecting the least. Let us acknowledge frankly that in most cases they are obeying the laws of war by being courteous. If they handcuffed Pir Badshah Mian and Dr. Suresh Banerjee, they have not done so in the case of the Ali Brothers, Lala Lajpatrai, Maulana Mohiuddin or Pandit Motilal Nehru. Nor would I quarrel with handcuffing, if they imposed it on all. It is a gaol regulation to handcuff a prisoner. I should certainly have loved to travel to Allahabad to see Pandit Motilal Nehru and his son being handcuffed together and made to walk to their destination. I would have loved to watch the radiant smiles on their faces in the consciousness of their handcuffs hastening the advent of Swaraj. But the Government did not provide any such treat. What I do not expect, what I do not want for the sake of man's dignity, is a repetition of petty and degrading insults of the Punjab or the unthinkable inhumanities of the Moplah death wagon. But Non-co-operators have stipulated for no such immunity. We have conceived the possibility of the worst happening, and under a full sense of our responsibility pledged ourselves to remain non-violent. Swaraj is within our grasp : let it not step away from us by self-forgetfulness.

With leaders in gaols, there should be *hartals* wherever the prince goes. No meetings are necessary to organise them. The people have sufficient training for spontaneous action. Let the Government realise that it was not force, but willing response that brought about *hartals.* There must be nowhere any unauthorised or ill-conceived Civil Disobedience. Every forward step must be taken with the greatest deliberation and calmness. The people can discuss things in their own homes. The merchants meet a thousand times for business. They may easily discuss and decide matters arising out of the situation as it developes hourly. But whilst I would like *hartals* to follow the Prince, I would take no risk of violence and would not countenance the slightest exercise of force or threat of it. Absence of prescribed *hartal* would somewhat discredit us, but an outbreak of violence would retard our progress and may even indefinitely postpone Swaraj.

I hope, too, that every vacancy in the ranks of delegates will be filled, and that there will be a full attendance at the Congress of members who will have made up their minds as to what they want and how they will have it.

Whilst this was being printed, advice was received that the three ladies were discharged after a few hours' detention. Nevertheless, I allow the writing to go to the public, as the argument holds good in the main. I observe, too, that the ladies have been discharged with a caution !

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.—Begum Abul Kalam Azad sends me the following telegraphic message by letter post :

"Judgment has been delivered to-day in the case

against my husband Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. He has been sentenced to only one year rigorous imprisonment. This is astoundingly less than what I was waiting for. If conviction and imprisonment be the reward of national service, you will admit that great injustice has been done to him in the inadequacy of the sentence. It does not even approximate to the minimum of his deserts. I make bold to inform you that I offer my humble services to fill up the gap caused by his absence in the rank of national workers in Bengal. All those activities which he performed will still continue to be carried on normally. This is a heavy burden for my shoulders, but I have fullest faith in God's help. Undoubtedly, the void created by his absence is not merely in work in Bengal, but also in all-India activities. It is, however, beyond my fragile frame to endeavour to make up for the bigger void. Before this, during his last four years' internment, I have gone through a first test, and I am confident that, in this my second trial, I will with God's grace come off triumphant. For the last six years my health has been very broken down and mental exertion has become a positive torture. That was why the Maulana hitherto insisted on my not taking an active part in his activities and patriotic strivings. I had, however, all along determined to consecrate my whole being completely and unreservedly to national duties after his conviction. From to-day, I will discharge all the duties connected with the Bengal Provincial Khilafat Committees with the assistance of my brother. My husband has asked me to convey to you his loving and reverent greetings and the following message: 'At the present juncture, both the sides—the Government and the country—are wholly unprepared for any compromise. The only duty before us is to prepare

ourselves. Bengal will, in the next stage, also retain the lead which it has established to-day. Kindly add the name of Bengal to that of Bardoli Taluka. And if any time comes for a settlement, do please not give to our release the importance which is unfortunately being attached to it to-day. Have the terms of settlement fixed with the single end in view of our national aspirations, unconcerned with the question of our release'."

I have not yet received the telegram, although the letter of advice tells me that it was sent both to Ahmedabad and Bardoli. I am able to give the telegram to the public, only because the Secretary of the Bengal Provincial Khilafat Committee has very kindly sent me a copy by letter post at the instance of the Begum Saheba. It is a matter of no small comfort that ladies, occupying the highest station in life, are coming forward, one after another, to step into the breach created by the withdrawal of male national workers. I tender my congratulations to Begum Abul Kalam Azad for her having offered to take her share in the public work. The readers will take to heart the message of the Maulana. It is perfectly true that neither the Government nor the country is today prepared for any compromise. The Government will not be, till we have suffered long and suffered more. Bengal has certainly led in the direction. Bardoli has yet done little. Twice has it been baulked of its privilege by cruel Nature, but it is a matter of no consequence whether it is Bengal or Bardoli which leads, so long as we get rid of a system which, as is daily becoming more and more clear, is based upon terrorism. In the present mood of the country, there is little danger of the vital interests being sacrificed, as the Maulana fears, to the momentary pleasure of securing the release of Non-co-operation prisoners.

A Wife's Faith.--Mrs. Stokes in writing to Mr. Andrews says:

"I know it well that when my husband is in jail with many other sons of India, suffering for the sake of righteousness, he is sure to be happy. I am quite confident that the Almighty God will hear the cry of the oppressed and deliver His judgment."

The reader will be glad to hear that Mr. Stokes is happy and well in his prison. He is occasionally seen by friends in Lahore.

9th February, 1921

A MUNICIPAL ENTERPRISE

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The reader will find elsewhere* the text of the correspondence between the municipality of Nadiad and the Government of Bombay as represented by the Collector of the District of Kaira in which Nadiad is situated. Nadiad is an important town in Gujarat with a population of about 35,000. Its municipality has an elected chairman and contains a majority of elected members. Nadiad is noted for its educational activity and has the honour of having produced some of the best educated sons of Gujarat. The town has two high schools. Its aided high school has been nationalized. The municipality runs several primary schools which instruct over five thousand children.

The question before the citizens was to nationalize all the primary schools. The rate-payers, instead of withdrawing the children from these schools, passed a resolution calling upon the municipality to nationalize the primary schools. They were in receipt of a yearly grant

* Omitted in this collection.

of Rs. 21,000 and were naturally under the control and supervision of the Education Department. The municipality, therefore, resolved in accordance with the instructions of the electors to nationalize the schools and informed the government accordingly. It will be noticed that the municipality in its proceedings has directly referred to the Congress resolution on Non-co-operation and has adopted this bold policy in furtherance of the attainment of Swaraj.*

*Mahatma Gandhi seems to be of opinion that municipalities being elected bodies should, wherever possible, carry out the wishes of the electorates. The following notes from *Young India* further elucidate his views:

The faithful few.—All honour to the few Municipalities which have had the courage to come to the right decision of abstention from the Peace celebrations. While it is a sign of our growing civic consciousness, the paucity serves but to bring into high relief the ground we have to cover before we can prove to the world that we are a self-respecting people. The proceedings at the meeting of some of the corporations where the question of participation came to be considered will illustrate our meaning. The Ahmedabad Municipality has 40 councillors. About thirty attended the meeting and, whilst about three-fourth of the number voted against participation, one-fourth voted for it. Now, it is impossible to believe that those who voted against and they were a very large majority could have been till the day of the meeting insensible to the public feeling in the matter, but they were surely indifferent in the matter until a letter protesting against the contribution came for consideration. In Allahabad, there was no quorum on the first day the question came to be considered, and on the day it was decided there was a small attendance. That is also an index of our indifference. In Amraoti, whilst the question whether something should be contributed or not was dropped altogether, because the councillors realised that the contribution was against the strong current of public feeling and against law, there were some who even then decided that they should contribute to the Peace celebrations fund privately. The instance of Amraoti suggests a painful reflection. It shows that, though the members there had a full appreciation of the public feeling in the matter, some of them had not the *nerve* to take a decisive action even in a matter in which they

There was the technical point about the municipality's statutory obligation to conduct schools under the direct supervision of the Government. On this the

---

thought the law was clear and adopted the doubtful device of compensating for the displeasure of Government by private contributions. These instances have a distinct moral for both the voting public and the municipal councillors. The fact that many municipalities voted the contribution means not that the members were all in favour of participation and they could not be insensible to the state of public feeling in the matter, but because they either have given no thought to a matter, of the most vital importance or because they are cowed down by a superstitious fear of displeasing the authorities. The beginning though small is an unmistakable index that the rapid growth of public life will bring in councillors with better sense of self-respect and their duties as representatives of the people.—17th December, 1920.

Worthy of Imitation.—Mr. Vithalbhai Patel is never so happy as when he is fighting Municipal or Legislative Councils. He was therefore in his element on the 6th inst, when he moved and carried in the Thana District Board the following resolutions:

1. This Board expresses its sorrow to find that the sale of liquor is on the increase, resulting in the loss of public morals, health and wealth.

2. This Board welcomes the popular movement for removing the evil, and congratulates the organisers upon this exhibition of a spirit of public service.

3. This Board notes with regret the absence of any power of prohibiting the sale of liquor within its jurisdiction. Therefore, the Board is of opinion, that it should take advantage of all the powers it possesses of undertaking picketing on its responsibility, of helping Congress Committees and of compensating those liquor-dealers who may voluntarily undertake to close their shops.

4. For the purposes aforesaid, the Board hereby appoints a Committee consisting of the Chairman, the Vice-chairman the mover, and Mr. Acharya with powers to conduct or control picketing and to bring about total prohibition.

5. The Board authorises the said committee to incur an expense not exceeding Rs. 3000 as a beginning, and will be prepared to incur greater expenditure in future if necessary.

municipality's attitude is thus stated. "It is in complete sympathy with the movement of Non-co-operation designed for the attainment, among other things, of full

---

This is distinctly a courageous step. If the Board persists in the enforcement of its resolutions to the bitter end, and brings about a speedy closing of all the liquor-shops within its jurisdiction, it will have covered itself with glory, and will have rendered a signal service to the country. I hope that Mr. Patel's initiative will be copied by other members and councillors throughout India. A simultaneous move on the part of Local Boards and Municipalities all over India will strengthen the hands of reformers all over, will force the hands of the Government and is therefore likely to obviate all danger of violence, which a three-cornered tussle between pickets, the police and the publicans is likely to precipitate.—13th July, 1921.

A Municipal Model.—The Rajpur (C. P.) Municipality has adopted by a majority the following proposals :—

That all the boys reading in the Municipal Schools should have the national uniform of *Khadi* coat or *Kudta* and *Khadi* cap from the 1st August 1921.

That the 1st August, 1921 should be declared a holiday in all the Municipal schools and offices in honour of the late Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak.

That this Committee expects its servants to use country-made cloth.

That all dresses supplied to Municipal servants should be of *Khadi*.

It is a wise use the Raipur Municipality has made of its powers. Indeed all the municipalities can carry out all the constructive permanent features of Non-co-operation without being wholly Non-co-operationist. There is not one among the foregoing proposals, to which reasonable exception could possibly be taken by anybody. Any municipality which adopts Swadeshi, the vernacular of its province as the medium of its proceedings, the amelioration of the suppressed classes, the abolition of the drink traffic, prostitution and such other things will assist the work of national purification, and thus justify its existence.—11th September, 1921.

Well done Nagpur—The Municipality of Nagpur certainly deserves congratulations for its public service, in that it has taken a referendum on total prohibition. The result is striking. Two thousand three hundred and forty three voters registered their votes. Of these two thousand three hundred and thirty two recorded their votes in favour

Swaraj and, so long as this municipality remains in existence, it will be its bounden duty to help the people of Nadiad in achieving the national purpose. . . So far as the legal difficulty is concerned, it is respectfully suggested that *sec.* 58, if it runs counter to the express wish of the residents of Nadiad, must automatically remain in abeyance because, if the Board correctly understands the temper of the people of Nadiad, they are clearly determined to have nothing to do with Government control over the education of the children, and it need hardly be pointed out that the Board is in full sympathy with the determination of the people."

No one can take exception to the admirable spirit of the people or the correctness of the attitude of the municipality. Of course, the Government may, if it dare, disband the municipality. But any such disbandment

---

of total prohibition. Six voted with reservations, and only *five* voted against prohibition. The reader will be pained to find, that of the five voters against prohibition two were graduates. It is possible to look at the revelation in another light, and say that the two graduates had the courage of their conviction to incur popular odium and vote in accordance with their conscience. There is no doubt as to the educative value of such a referendum. I wish the Secretary of the Congress Committee, at whose instance the poll was taken, had given the full strength of the electoral roll. It is to be hoped, that other municipalities would follow the example of Nagpur.—29th September, 1921.

Imitate Lahore—The Municipality of Lahore which contains a majority of Non-co-operators has resolved that all its cab-drivers and such other employees shall wear Khadi caps and that all municipal departments are to use as much Khadi as possible. The lawyers of Amritsar are said to have adopted Khadi for their dresses. I hope that the other municipalities will follow the good example set by Lahore and that the lawyers all over India will follow the Amritsar precedent. This is about the least that they can do for the country and Swadeshi.—11th August, 1921.

must be futile, if the rate-payers are determined not to have government control over the education of their children. This is a peaceful revolution on a small scale. The success of the movement is due to the cohesion of the people and their ability to manage and finance the education of their children. Violence being eschewed, the people of Nadiad are able to give an education in Swaraj to their children. What is true of the municipality regarding the education of the children is true of the whole of India in every other respect.

When the people have one mind, ability of management, and recognise the necessity of non-violence, if only as a business proposition, Swaraj is won. Finance is a matter of little consideration. For the Government does not bring money from heaven. It receives, to paraphrase an expressive Gujarati saying, an anvil weight of metal and returns a needle weight. And the pity and the disgrace of it is that, even with that niggardly donation, it imprisons and emasculates the tender mind of the nation. Were it not for self-delusion, we would at least refuse to be party to the ruin of our own children. The municipality of Nadiad has shown how easy the whole process of nationalization of education is; Lala Daulat Ram's articles* have shown how easy the question of finance is, and how the ordinary fees are almost enough to conduct all our educational institutions. I hope that the object lesson given by the municipality of Nadiad will not be lost upon other municipalities similarly situated.

* Omitted in this collection.

25th October, 1921

CHIRALA-PERALA

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Chirala-Perala is in fact one village not far from the sea, with a nice climate and containing a compact population of about 15,000. The place is situated in the Andhra Province, and possesses in Mr. Gopal Krishnayya a talented and self-sacrificing leader, who has by his perseverance and sacrifice been able to hold the people together without difficulty. Municipal government is a transferred department. The minister in charge began last year to make his presence felt by these brave people. A vexatious trading licence was imposed upon them. They retorted by trading without a licence. The result was a prosecution and convictions against the resisters, who, including an old woman, went to gaol. The Government has been endeavouring to impose a municipality on the people, who protested against the measure. But what could a minister who had accepted office in the teeth of public opposition do but seek to impose his will upon the people and show that he cared little for it?

Let us see what the municipality meant to the people; certainly not better sanitation, for the place was unusually well kept by the people themselves; certainly not more education, for the people were non-co-operators. It meant more taxation, more interference with their liberty. This was an intolerable evil for the people.

They therefore decided to remove to a bare place of ground near by outside the municipal area. They erected huts there for residence and evacuated Chirala Perala about May last. Nothing daunted, the minister has sought and received the assistance of the Revenue

Department which has levied penal cesses in respect of the sheds on the ground that they were erected on Government waste. The rate for each shed is Rs. 10-2-6, whereas the value thereof is only Rs. 25. If this payment is not made, the occupants have to vacate the sheds.

The commencement of repression is thus described in its note by the Andhra Provincial Congrees Committee:

> In the repression at Chirala-Perala, the roll of honour is lengthening. Already 12 men and one woman have served out their term of imprisonment for refusing to pay the municipal taxes. Three men are now undergoing rigorous imprisonment in the Central Jail at Rajahmandry, six more are awaiting orders of incarceration. It is extraordinary that these were sentenced to imprisonment nearly a month ago and the sentence held in abeyance. We have not heard of any other instance in which convicted persons are quietly told that they might go home and await orders, not even bail bonds being taken from them. Many more in Chirala-Perala are prepared to fill the prisons. The struggle is being carried on with remarkable vigour and persistence, though the dislocation of business caused by the evacuation and the loss of living in the case of poorer inhabitants have entailed serious hardship.
>
> The property of the convicted persons has been attached and brought to sale a number of times at Bapatla and at Guntur for realising the amount of fine levied on them. But no bidders have come forward in either place. This is an eloquent testimony to the sympathy generally felt for the sufferings of the Chirala-Perala patriots.

Here we have a concrete instance of the meaning of the reforms and responsibility. I doubt not that the minister believes that what he is doing is good for the people. Did not the English officials, whenever they imposed anything on us even the Rowlatt Act, seek to justify the imposition on the ground of public weal? What Non-co-operation is fighting among other things, is the spirit of patronage. We must have the liberty to

do evil before we learn to do good. Even 'liberty' must not be 'forced' upon us. The democratic spirit demands that a most autocratic minister must yield to a people's will or resign office. He must be patient enough to carry enlightened public opinion with him even in the most perfect measures of amelioration.

The brave people of Chirala-Perala have challenged the Government to do its worst and refused to have a municipality. They need not have done so. They might have waited for Swaraj. But they chose to do otherwise. The responsibility is entirely theirs. They may not now yield in any circumstance whatsoever. Nor must they under provocation lose their heads. They must cheerfully let the Government subject them to any penalty it chooses to inflict upon them. By their meek and unyielding suffering, they will cover themselves and India with glory, and will give an object lesson to the country in non-violence.

27th October, 1921

MUNICIPALITIES, BEWARE

The Government of Bombay note* regarding the Ahmedabad, Surat and Nadiad municipalities shows that it refuses to see the writing on the wall.† Its dictatorial tone is now no longer in keeping with the

*The Note condemned the action of the municipalities in sympathising with and handing over their schools to Non-co-operators and exhorted the rate-payers to safeguard their interests by proceeding against the municipal councillors under the law.

† *Young India* of 16th February, 1922, contained the following:

Ahmedabad and Surat—Ahmedabad and Surat Municipalities have been superseded—not because they have been found inefficient but because they have been too efficient and too independent. These two

rising spirit of the people. Its incitement to the individual rate-payers to sue the councillors who believe they have performed their duty is hardly dignified. The proper course for the Government was to let the municipalities take their own course and not to invite trouble. As it is, the Government note is calculated to precipitate a crisis. The councillors must take up the challenge and dare the Government to disregard the municipalities if they choose. The municipalities must have the right to misgovern themselves if they wish. If a city is misgoverned, it is as much the rate-payers' fault as is the

---

municipalities and that of Nadiad have been putting up a brave, dignified and orderly fight against the Government interference and undue control. Their crime consisted in freeing primary education from Government control. They gave up Government assistance and noted that the elected councillors who have commanded a majority have always acted after close consultation with the rate-payers. But that is just what the Government evidently does not want. It makes the public opinion effective.

The duty before the councillors and the electors is quite simple. They must still retain control of primary education. The rate-payers may refuse to pay the rates to the nominated committees that the Government may impose upon the citizens and they must pay for the national education of their children. The councillors must keep together and put up as it were a national municipality in so far as it is practicable. In my opinion, there is hardly a department, for running of which enlightened citizens require Government aid. There is no earthly reason why the Ahmedabadis, the Nadiadis and the Suratis should not be able to sweep and light their own streets, educate their own children and look after their sick and their water-supply without hanging on to the Government. The police control they do not possess. The only thing for which they may need Government assistance is in enforcing payment of rates. Replace Government force by force of public opinion and you have the sanction for collecting rates. More money is raised in Ahmedabad by voluntary contributions than by enforced rates. The public will watch the duel between nominated committees and popularly elected representatives in awakened constituencies.

councillors'. But our wise Government, whilst recognising the independent existence of the municipalities, wants to stick to the letter of the law which killeth and would itself rule instead of letting the municipalities alone, so long as they do not cost the Government anything. The municipalities must now take up the challenge and prepare for action on its part. Government may succeed in getting a few rate-payers to file suits. That will be the least it can do. The most it can do is to disband the municipalities concerned. And the most of the Government should prove most welcome, if only the protestants are a strong body. Assuming that they are, they must simply educate the rate-payers to understand what is happening and to prepare them for battle. I can see Swaraj peeping even through the Government note, if the latter take and the former are ready for action. So long as there is no disbandment, the municipalities have all power ; as soon as there is disbandment, the Government is powerless, assuming of course that the rate-payers are strong, intelligent and united. The rate-payers are all that but they require to be organised for action. Hitherto the people have been the football of officials or so-called representatives. Non-co-operation enables the people to become the players in the game. Representatives *must* represent or they perish.

17th November, 1921

THE PEN OR THE SWORD

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

In Lahore on the Mall there is a statue of John Lawrence with a defiant look in the face, with the pen in the right hand and the sword in the left. The writing

underneath is, 'Will you have the pen or the sword?' As a work of art it is said to be very good. But it has always been a matter of offence to the citizens of Lahore. They neither want the pen nor the sword imposed upon them.

The statue is municipal property. It was put up in the early eighties when the sense of self-respect was not so keen as now, though I understand that even when it was put up, some of the citizens keenly felt the indignity. Recently the Lahore Municipality passed a resolution by a majority vote ordering removal of the statue to the Town Hall building pending final disposal. The resolution was sent in due course to the Government as all resolutions are. There or four days after, an engineer was sent by the Municipality to see how the statue could be removed. Without any notice to the Municipality, the Deputy Commissioner sent a party of police to turn away the engineer and his men. And when the Municipality wanted to know why and how this undue interference took place, the Commissioner issued the following order:

> "At a general meeting of the Lahore Municipal Committee held on the 8th Instant, the following resolution was passed with regard to the Lawrence Statue:
>
> (1) That the statue be removed,
>
> (2) that it may be removed for the present to the Town Hall building,
>
> (3) that a sub-committee be appointed to consider the final disposal of the statue.
>
> I consider at present from a perusal of such records as I have been able to consult, that the statue cannot be removed from the present site without the consent of the Punjab Government.
>
> Secondly, I consider from the tone of the debates in the committee on this subject that it is possible that the statue, after removal by the committee, will not be treated with proper respect, with the result that annoyance will be caused to a number of the residents of Lahore.

> For these reasons, and pending consideration and decision by the Government of its rights in this matter, I suspend the execution of the two first parts of the above resolution relating to the immediate removal of the station.

It is clear that the Deputy Commissioner was guilty of assault in having sent the police to turn out the engineer who was doing his legal duty. The Commissioner's order is an illustration of the meaning of the pen. The Commissioner's pen is just as much an outrage as the Deputy Commissioner's sword. The Commissioner, because he has the sword, has arrogated to himself judicial powers which do not belong to him. Whether the Municipality has or has not the power to dispose of its own property is purely for a court of law to decide. And what right has the Commissioner to impute malice to the Municipality? The fact is that the Commissioner cannot tolerate the disappearance from a fashionable quarter of Lahore of the spirit that the statue represents. So he has not hesitated to dictate the law to the Municipality.

Thus what was but an ordinary incident in the affairs of a Municipality which has responded to the new awakening has become a matter of the highest public importance. The citizens, the rate-payers of Lahore, must by public meetings support the councillors who have been instrumental in passing the resolution. The councillors must take prompt action and give notice, if they have not already done so, that unless Government show good reason to the contrary, the Municipality must do its duty and remove the statue.

The Commissioner has unintentionally given a golden opportunity to the civil resisters of Lahore to try civil resistance in the cleanest and the most intensive manner. If the Government defy the Municipality and

use its brute force to prevent removal of the statue, the civil resisters can, after due notice to the Government, proceed to the site with the intention of removing the statue and offer themselves for arrest or being shot if the Government so wishes.

But this last step can only be taken by disciplined people. It can only be taken when Lahorians are ready to act as one man. There should be no crowds gathering. Only a few individuals can go at a time, say five, of whom one will become the spokesman. They must not bluster, must not argue but simply court arrest. For the immediate object would be not the removal of the statue but inviting arrest. Removal must be the result, if enough men and women offer themselves as sacrifice. There must be a perfect spirit of non-violence prevailing among the people in order to ensure the success of such civil disobedience. Whilst I point out the drastic remedy of civil disobedience, I must warn the citizens of Lahore against adopting the advice without the greatest deliberation. My own experience of a Lahore crowd is that it does not think. It knows no discipline. The volunteers must work methodically amongst the people to create an atmosphere of peace and discipline. I was grieved to notice that, at the Convocation meeting organised on the 9th instant by the National Board of Education, several people had entered Bradlaugh Hall without tickets and without permission. This is not merely uncivil but criminal disobedience. For they entered by force where they knew their force would not be resisted by force. Such men are unfit for civil disobedience which presupposes a scrupulous and willing observance of all laws which do not hurt the moral sense. Obedience to laws of voluntary associations as the rule of the managers of the Convocation is only the

first step to voluntary and ungrudging obedience to the laws imposed by the state. Thoughtless disobedience means disruption of society. The first thing therefore for those who aspire after civil disobedience is to learn the art of willingly obeying laws of voluntary associations such as Congresses, Conferences and other bodies and similarly obeying the state laws whether they like them or not. Civil disobedience is not a state of lawlessness and licence, but presupposes a law-abiding spirit combined with self-restraint.

13h July, 1921

A CONFESSION OF FAITH

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

A strange anonymous letter has been received by me, admiring me for having taken up a cause that was dearest to Lokamanya's heart, and telling me that his spirit was residing in me and that I must prove a worthy follower of his. The letter, moreover, admonishes me not to lose heart in the prosecution of the Swaraj programme, and finishes off by accusing me of imposture in claiming to be politically a disciple of Gokhale. I wish correspondents will throw off the slavish habit of writing anonymously. We, who are developing the Swaraj spirit, must cultivate the courage of fearlessly speaking out our mind. The subject-matter of the letter, however, being of public importance, demands a reply. I cannot claim the honour of being a follower of the late Lokamanya. I admire hime like millions of his countrymen for his indomitable will, his vast learning, his love of country, and above all the purity of his private life and great sacrifice. Of all the

men of modern times, he captivated most the imagination of his people. He breathed into us the spirit of Swaraj. No one perhaps realised the evil of the existing system of Government as Mr. Tilak did. And in all humility I claim to deliver his message to the country as truly as the best of his disciples. But I am conscious that my method is not Mr. Tilak's method.*

*The following is from *Young India* of 28th January, 1920:

Lok. Tilak wrote to *Young India* under date Poona City, 28th January, 1920: I am sorry to see that in your article on 'Reform Resolution' in the last issue, you have represented me as holding that I considered 'every thing fair in politics'. I write this to you to say that my view is not correctly represented herein. Politics is a game of worldy people, and not of *Sahdus*, and instead of the maxim "akkhodhenajine kkhodham" as preached by Buddha, I prefer to rely on the maxim of Shri Krishna "ye gatthaa maam prapadyamthe thaamsthatthaiva bhajaamyaham". That explains the whole difference and also the meaning of my phrase 'responsive co-operation.' Both methods are equally honest and righteous but the one is more suited to this world than the other. Any further explanation about the difference will be found in my "Gita-Rahasya".

Mahatma Gandhi replied to the above as follows: I naturally feel the greatest diffidence about joining issue with the Lokamanya in matters involving questions of interpretation of religious works. But there are things in or about which instinct transcends even interpretation. For me there is no conflict between the two texts quoted by the Lokamanya. The Buddhist text lays down an eternal principle. The text from the Bhagvad Gita shows to me how the principle of conquering hate by love, untruth by truth, can and must be applied. If it be true that God metes out the same measure to us that we mete out to others, it follows that, if we would escape condign punishment, we may out-return anger for anger but gentleness even against anger. And this is the law not for the unworldly but essentially for the worldy. With deference to the Lokamanya, I venture to say that it betrays mental laziness to think that the world is not for *Sahdus*. The epitome of all religions is to promote *Purushartha*, and *Purushartha* is nothing but a desperate attempt to become *Sahdu*, *i.e.*, to become gentleman in every sense of the term.

Finally, when I wrote the sentence about 'everything being fair in

And that is why I have still difficulty with some of the Maharashtra leaders. But I sincerely think that Mr. Tilak did not disbelieve in my method. I enjoyed the privilege of his confidence. And his last word to me in the presence of several friends was, just a fortnight before his death, that mine was an excellent method if the people could be persuaded to take to it. But he said he had doubts. I know no other method; I can only hope that, when the final test comes, the country will be proved to have assimilated the method of Non-violent Non-co-operation. Nor am I unaware of my other limitations. I can lay no claim to scholarship. I have not his powers of organisation, I have no compact disciplined party to lead, and having been an exile for twenty-three years, I cannot claim the experience that the Lokamanya had of India. Two things we had in common to the fullest measure—love of country and the steady pursuit of Swaraj. I can, therefore, assure the anonymous writer that, yielding to none in my reverence for the memory of the deceased, I will march side by side with the foremost of the Lokamanya's disciples in the pursuit of Swaraj. I know that the only offering acceptable to him is the quickest attainment of Swaraj by India. That and nothing else can give his spirit peace.

Discipleship, however, is a sacred personal matter.

---

politics' according to the Lokamanya's creed, I had in mind his oft-repeated quotation "shaddham prathi shaddhyam." To me it enunciates bad law. And I shall not despair of the Lokamanya with all his acumen agreeably surprising India one day with a philosophical dissertation proving the falsity of the doctrine. In any case, I pit the experience of a third of a century against the doctrine underlying "shaddham prati shaddhyam." The true law is "shaddham pratyapi satyam."

I fell at Dadabhai's feet in 1888, but he seemed to be too far away from me. I could be as son to him, not disciple. A disciple is more than son. Discipleship is a second birth. It is a voluntary surrender. In 1896, I met almost all the known leaders of India in connection with my South African mission. Justice Ranade awed me. I could hardly talk in his presence. Badruddin Tyabji fathered me, and asked me to be guided by Ranade and Pherozeshah. The latter became a patron. His will had to be law. "You must address a public meeting on the 26th September, and you must be punctual." I obeyed. On the 25th evening, I was to wait on him. I did.

"Have you written out your speech?" he inquired.

"No, sir."

"That won't do, young man. Can you write it out to-night?"

"Munshi, you must go to Mr. Gandhi and receive the manuscript from him. It must be printed over night and you must send me a copy." Turning to me, he added, "Gandhi, you must not write a long speech, you do not know Bombay audiences cannot stand long addresses." I bowed.

The lion of Bombay taught me to take orders. He did not make me his disciple. He did not even try.

I went thence to Poona. I was an utter stranger. My host first took me to Mr. Tilak. I met him surrounded by his companions. He listened, and said, "We must arrange a meeting for you. But perhaps you do not know that we have unfortunately two parties. You must give us a non-party man as chairman. Will you see Dr. Bhandarkar?" I consented and retired. I have no firm impression of Mr. Tilak, except to recall that he shook off my nervousness by his affectionate familiarity.

I went thence, I think, to Gokhale, and then to Dr. Bhandarkar. The latter greeted me, as a teacher his pupil.

"You seem to be an earnest and enthusiastic young man. Many people do not come to see me at this the hottest part of the day. I never now-a-days attend public meetings. But you have recited such a pathetic story that I must make an exception in your favour."

I worshipped the venerable doctor with his wise face. But I could not find for him a place on that little throne. It was still unoccupied. I had many heroes, but no king.

It was different with Gokhale, I cannot say why. I met him at his quarters on the college ground. It was like meeting an old friend, or better still, a mother after a long separation. His gentle face put me at ease in a moment. His minute inquiries about myself and my doings in South Africa at once enshrined him in my heart. And as I parted from him, I said to myself, 'you are my man'. And from that moment, Gokhale never lost sight of me. In 1901, on my second return from South Africa, we came closer still. He simply 'took me in hand', and began to fashion me. He was concerned about how I spoke, dressed, walked and ate. My mother was not more solicitous about me than Gokhale. There was, so far as I am aware, no reserve between us. It was really a case of love at first sight, and it stood the severest strain in 1913. He seemed to me all I wanted as a political worker—pure as crystal, gentle as a lamb, brave as a lion and chivalrous to a fault. It does not matter to me that he may not have been any of these things. It was enough for me that I could discover no fault in him to cavil at. He was and remains for me the most perfect man on the political field. Not, therefore, that we had no differences. We differed even in

1901 in our views on social customs, *e.g.*, widow re-marriage. We discovered differences in our estimate of western civilization. He frankly differed from me in my extreme views on non-violence. But these differences mattered neither to him nor to me. Nothing could put us asunder. It were blasphemous to conjecture what would have happened if he were alive to-day. I know that I would have been working under him. I have made this confession, because the anonymous letter hurt me, when it accused me of imposture about my political discipleship. Had I been remiss in my acknowledgment to him who is now dumb? I thought I must declare my faithfulness to Gokhale, especially when I seemed to be living in a camp which the Indian world calls opposite.

4th August, 1920

LOKAMANYA

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak is no more. It is difficult to believe of him as dead. He was so much part of the people. No man of our times had the hold on the masses that Mr. Tilak had. The devotion that he commanded from thousands of his countrymen was extraordinary. He was unquestionably the idol of his people. His word was law among thousands. A giant among men has fallen. The voice of the lion is hushed.

What was the reason for his hold upon his countrymen? I think the answer is simple. His patriotism was a passion with him. He knew no religion but love of his country. He was a born democrat. He believed in the rule of majority with an intensity that fairly frightened

me. But that gave him his hold. He had an iron will which he used for his country. His life was an open book. His tastes were simple.* His private life was

* The following appeared in *Young India* of 4th August, 1921:

Reminiscences of Lokamanya.—When Lokamanya went to Delhi to interview Mr. Montagu, Government prohibited the holding of any procession in his honour. The illiterate people on the street were talking among themselves:—"Aj Poona-ka Raja ane-vala hai. Sarkar us-se bahut darti hai." (The King of Poona is coming to-day. Government are mightily afraid of him.)

* * *

A friend of Tilak once asked him in course of conversation, 'Balvantrao, what portfolio will you select under Swaraj? Will you be Prime Minister or will you be Foreign Member?' Tilak replied, 'No, sir. Under Swaraj I will become Professor of Mathematics in a Swadeshi college and retire from public life. I detest politics. I still wish to write a book on differential calculus. The country is in a very bad way and none of you is doing anything for it. So I am compelled to look into the matter.'

* * *

There was a meeting in Bombay, where many scholars attended. Tilak delivered a learned and original address on Chaldean civilisation and the parallels between Indian and Iranian civilisations. When the meeting was over, the President who was a Parsi said, 'Mr. Tilak, you are making a misuse of your talents. With such a magnificent intellect, you are eminently fitted for historical research, and if you devote yourself to it, you will acquire a world-wide reputation. Leaving this, why do you entangle yourself in the mire of politics?' Tilak replied, 'India is not a sterile woman. When there is Swaraj, there will be thousands of scholars like myself. To-day there is a supreme necessity for every one of us to run to our country's succour, and to devote our abilities, our energy and our all to the attainment of Swaraj.'

* * *

When the "Rashtramata" was started in Bombay, there was a talk about tables, chairs and other requisites for its office. Tilak said, "When we started the 'Kesari' and the 'Maratha', we had no such paraphernalia of editorial dignity. We got not a pie from the papers. We used to roll up our bedding, and that served us as a

spotlessly clean. He had dedicated his wonderful talents to his country. No man preached the gospel of the Swaraj with the consistency and the insistence of Lokamanya. His countrymen therefore implicitly believed in him. His courage never failed him. His optimism was irrepressible. He had hoped to see Swaraj fully established during his life-time. If he failed, it was not his fault. He certainly brought it nearer by many a year. It is for us, who remain behind, to put forth redoubled effort to make it a reality in the shortest possible time.

Lokamanya was an implacable foe of the bureaucracy, but this is not to say that he was a hater of Englishmen or English rule. I warn Englishmen against making the mistake of thinking that he was their enemy.

I had the privilege of listening to an impromptu, learned discourse by him, at the time of the last Calcutta Congress on Hindi being the national language. He had just returned from the Congress pandal. It was a

---

table. Our articles, written on such loose yielding stuff, were still powerful and trenchant enough'.

* * *

When the New English School was first started, it naturally did not get very bright students. Its boys were either dull or mischievous. When some one was disappointed at this, Tilak said, 'there lies our real test. When we make something even of such boys, the people will begin to believe in us.'

* * *

Tilak drew a salary of Rs. 30 from the school. One of his comrades remarked that on such an income they would hardly be able to save enough to purchase funeral requisites in case they died. Tilak replied, 'Society must bother about it more than ourselves. They will see to the burning of our corpse for purposes of sanitation, if not of hero-worship.

D. B. KALELKAR

(From the Gujarati "Navajivan".)

treat to listen to his calm discourse on Hindi. In the course of his address, he paid a glowing tribute to the English for their care of the Vernaculars. His English visit, in spite of his sad experience of English juries, made him a staunch believer in British democracy and he even seriously made the amazing suggestion that India should instruct it on the Punjab through the cinematograph. I relate this incident not because I share his belief (for I do not), but in order to show that he entertained no hatred for Englishmen. But he could not and would not put up with an inferior status of India and the Empire. He wanted immediate equality which he believed was his country's birthright. And in his struggle for India's freedom, he did not spare the Government. In the battle for freedom, he gave no quarter and asked for none. I hope that Englishmen will recognise the worth of the man whom India has adored.

For us, he will go down to the generations yet unborn as a Maker of Modern India. They will revere his memory as of a man who lived for them and died for them. It is blasphemy to talk of such a man as dead. The permanent essence of him abides with us for ever. Let us erect for the only Lokamanya of India an imperishable monument by weaving into our own lives his bravery, his simplicity, his wonderful industry and his love of his country. May God grant his soul peace.

17th November, 1921

INTROSPECTION

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Correspondents have written to me in pathetic language asking me not to commit suicide in January, should

Swaraj be not attained by then, and should I find myself outside the prison walls. I find that language but inadequately expresses one's thought, especially when the thought itself is confused or incomplete. My writing in the *Navajivan* was, I fancied, clear enough. But I observe that its translation has been misunderstood by many. The original too has not escaped the tragedy that has overtaken the translation.

One great reason for the misunderstanding lies in my being considered almost a perfect man. Friends who know my partiality for the Bhagavad-Gita have thrown relevant verses at me, and shown how my threat to commit suicide contradicts the teachings which I am attempting to live. All these mentors of mine seem to forget that I am but a seeker after Truth. I claim to have found the way to it. I claim to be making a ceaseless effort to find it. But I admit that I have not yet found it. To find Truth completely is to realise oneself and one's destiny, *i.e.*, to become perfect. I am painfully conscious of my imperfections, and therein lies all the strength I possess, because it is a rare thing for a man to know his own limitations.

If I was a perfect man, I own I should not feel the miseries of my neighbours as I do. As a perfect man, I should take note of them, prescribe a remedy and compel adoption by the force of unchallengeable Truth in me. But as yet, I only see as through a glass darkly and, therefore, have to carry conviction by slow and laborious processes, and then too, not always with success. That being so, I would be less than human if, with all my knowledge of avoidable misery pervading the land and of the sight of mere skeletons under the very shadow of the Lord of the Universe, I did not feel with and for all the suffering but dumb millions of India.

The hope of a steady decline in that misery sustains me; but suppose that, with all my sensitiveness to sufferings, to pleasure and pain, cold and heat, and with all my endeavour to carry the healing message of the spinning wheel to the heart, I have reached only the ear and never pierced the heart, suppose further that at the end of the year I find that the people are as sceptical as they are to-day about the present possibility of attainment of Swaraj by means of the peaceful revolution of the wheel. Suppose further, that I find that the excitement during the past twelve months and more has been only an excitement and a stimulation, but no settled belief in the programme, and lastly suppose that the message of peace has not penetrated the hearts of Englishmen, should I not doubt my *tapasya* and feel my unworthiness for leading the struggle? As a true man, what should I do? Should I not kneel down in all humility before my Maker, and ask Him to take away this useless body and make me a fitter instrument of service?

Swaraj does consist in the change of government and its real control by the people, but that would be merely the form. The substance that I am hankering after is a definite acceptance of the means and, therefore, a real change of heart on the part of the people. I am certain that it does not require ages for Hindus to discard the error of untouchability, for Hindus and Musalmans to shed enmity and accept heart friendship as an eternal factor of national life, for all to adopt the *charkha* as the only universal means of attaining India's economic salvation and finally for all to believe that India's freedom lies only through non-violence, and no other method. Definite, intelligent and free adoption by the nation of this programme, I hold, as the attainment of

the substance. The symbol, the transfer of power, is sure to follow, even as the seed truly laid must develop into a tree.

The reader will thus perceive that, what I accidentally stated to friends for the first time in Poona and then repeated to others, was but a confession of my imperfections and an expression of my feeling of unworthiness for the great cause which, for the time being, I seem to be leading. I have enunciated no doctrine of despair. On the contrary, I have felt never so sanguine, as I do at the time of writing, that we will gain the substance during this year. I have stated at the same time as a practical idealist that I should no more feel worthy to lead a cause which I might feel myself diffident of handling. The doctrine of labouring without attachment means as much a relentless pursuit of truth as a retracing after discovery of error and a renunciation of leadership without a pang after discovery of unworthiness. I have but shadowed forth my intense longing to lose myself in the Eternal and become merely a lump of clay in the Potter's divine hands, so that my service may become more certain, because uninterrupted by the baser self in me.

19th January, 1921

" INDIA " AND THE BRITISH COMMITTEE

The " Chronicle ", I observe, calls the decision to end the British Committee and 'India' an unfortunate decision. The argument advanced in support of the view is that the Constitution Committee had not advised abolition of the British Committee and ' India ', and that both were doing good work. It is true that the

Constitution Committee had not recommended abolition. But it should be remembered that the Committee was appointed at the Amritsar Congress, and its report was conceived before the Non-co-operation resolution of the Special Congress. Much has happened since then to revolutionize the country's ideas about foreign propaganda and the British Committee. The abolition was a matter of principle. It was felt that a Non-co-operation Congress could not keep a foreign agency for helping its work. The Congress has deliberately burnt its boats. It has decided to become self-reliant. The question of efficiency of the Committee as constituted becomes irrelevant. It is hardly dignified for the Congress in the altered situation to subsidise a foreign agency for doing propaganda work. No amount of misrepresentation about it could possibly blot out effective action by the nation.

Whether you advertise the fact or not, a body not receiving the food it needs dies. Whether we advertise the fact or not the moment we cease to support the government, it dies a natural death. Personally I dislike even the resolution voting the money to be used at the discretion of the All-India Congress Committee in foreign propaganda. We want all the money we need in this country. I would far rather invest Rs. 45,000 in spinning wheels or establishing primary schools than in wasting it in advertising our work. Every good deed is its own advertisement. And I shall certainly hope that the money will still be saved for a better purpose. So far as the newspaper "India" is concerned, we are certainly better without it. It raised in us false hopes. The British people are as much on their honour and trial as we are. If they choose to be misinformed by interested or dishonest journals, we cannot help

them. Have we not published the Congress Punjab report? Who believes it? Mr. Montagu discredits it and the British public echoes his opinion. In the art of advertising bogus things, the British journalists are to be beaten only by the Americans. I would not enter into the unequal competition and court defeat.

We must adopt new methods for combating the evils of sensational and untruthful journalism and public life. The Congress has given the lead by abolishing the Committee and its organ 'India.'

9th March, 1922

FOREIGN PROPAGANDA

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

I see that there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the scope of foreign propaganda undertaken by the Working Committee. I see that it was a mistake not to have published the report that was adopted by the Working Committee. Here it is:

Bardoli, 22nd Feb., 1922.

To

The Chairman of the Working Committee
of the All-India Congress Committee, Delhi.

Sir,—At the meeting of the Working Committee held at Surat on 31st January last, the following resolution was passed:

"The Working Committee records its firm conviction that dissemination of correct news about Indian political situation in foreign countries is absolutely essential and refers to Mahatma Gandhi all the correspondence on the subject of foreign propaganda now with the Working Secretary with a request that he should prepare a definite scheme in that behalf at an early date so as to enable the next meeting of the Working Committee to consider it."

Having considered the resolution and the papers forwarded to me by the Secretary, I beg to report as follows:—

In my opinion, it is not only undesirable but it may prove even harmful to establish at the present stage any Agency in any foreign country for the dissemination of correct news in such country about the political situation in India, for the following reasons:

First, because it would distract public attention and instead of making the people feel that they have to rely purely on their own strength, it will make them think of the effect of their actions on foreign countries and the support the latter can render to the national cause. This does not mean that we do not care for the world's support, but the way to gain that support is to insist upon the correctness of every one of our actions and rely upon the automatic capacity of Truth to spread itself.

Secondly, it is my experience that when an Agency is established for any special purpose, independent interest ceases to a certain extent and what is distributed by the Agency is previously discounted as coming from interested quarters.

Thirdly, the Congress will not be able to exercise effective check over such Agencies, and there is great danger of authoritative distribution of wrong information and wrong ideas about the struggle.

Fourthly, it is not possible at the present moment to send out of India any person of importance for the sole purpose of disseminating news in foreign countries, for such men are too few for the internal work.

I am therefore of opinion that the work of publishing the Congress Bulletin should be better organised, if necessary, by engaging a special editor for the purpose and by sending the Congress Bulletin regularly to the chief news agencies of the world. The editor should be instructed to enter into correspondence with those newspapers or news agencies which may be found to interest themselves in Indian questions.

It is my firm opinion based upon experience gained through the conduct of the journals I have edited in South Africa and here that the more solid the Congress work and the sufferings of the Congress men and women, the greater the publicity will the cause attain without special effort. From the exchanges of letter and correspondence that I receive day by day from all parts of the world in connection with the conduct of *Young India*, I observe that never was so much interest taken in Indian affairs through

> out the world as it is to-day. It follows that the interest will increase in the same proportion as the volume of our sufferings. The very best method of disseminating correct information about the political situation, therefore, is to make the Congress work purer, better organised and to evoke a greater spirit of suffering. Not only is curiosity thereby intensified, but people become more eager to understand the inwardness and the exact truth about the situation.
>
> I remain,
> Yours faithfully,
> (Sd.) M. K. GANDHI.

After having gone through all the papers that were given to me and after having heard all the arguments for and against, I remain convinced that at least for the present we want no news agency outside India. We want the whole world with us, but we shall not get it by carrying on a foreign agency. We can only send correct information to those who care for it. If a foreign country does not keep its own agency for gathering information from a particular country or about a particular movement, it is proof to me that that country is not interested in it. We have been without our agency in London now for nearly 15 months. I venture to think that we are no worse off to-day than we were 15 months ago. We are certainly better off because and to the extent that we have done substantial work in India itself. There are more people in the world interested to-day in India than they ever were. We, therefore, owe it to them that we place at their disposal correct information, but our duty must end there. I have before me a letter from Italy from an Italian editor telling me how deeply interested people in Italy are in the Indian movement, and the Italian newspapers are therefore busy instructing the Italian public in Indian affairs. This is what I call a natural and organic movement, but if on the strength of this information we were to establish an Indian

agency in Italy to awaken further interest, we would not mend matters but would spoil them by overdoing. We shall therefore better consult our own interest by relying upon our own strength to speak for itself.

Moreover, the Non-co-operation movement is one of self-help. Its formula is 'we shall succeed only to the extent of our strength and no further.' No certificate of merit from the world will give us success, if we have not earned it by the sweat of the brow. No condemnation of the movement will kill it, unless we are ourselves so fickle-hearted as to give it up by reason of the condemnation. Let us not therefore turn our attention from our own work. Let us simply mind our work and let sure that the world will mind us without any further effort. I am really jealous of even taking away from their work some of the young men who necessarily have to be engaged in the preparation and distribution of the Congress Bulletin. But we have really no authentic record of the progress of our work from week to week. The Congress Bulletin will therefore be useful as well for workers in India as it undoubtedly will be for our friends in foreign countries.

Being almost impatient to see the work inaugurated, the Working Committee has given me a free hand in organising the Bulletin. I hope to issue the first Bulletin next week and thenceforth it would be issued from week to week. The Bulletin will be sent to all the readers of "Young India" at a nominal charge to cover a part or the whole of the cost of paper and printing. "Young India" has a registered circulation of over 25,000 and it goes to almost all parts of the world. It has a comprehensive exchange list. The price for the subscribers to the Bulletin only will be announced later. The method I have sketched is intended to save the Congress as much

expense as possible and to give the widest publicity to the Bulletin. Whereas "Young India" represents my own views and those of my associates in the conduct of the journal, the Bulletin will contain nothing in the shape of individual views. It will be mainly a record of Congress activities all over India in all its multifarious department, and an epitome of newspaper opinions, both pro-Congress and anti-Congress. It will contain a Khilafat section registering all Khilafat activities during the preceding week. Such a Bulletin cannot become a success unless there is co-operation from all Congress and Khilafat workers. I invite therefore all who are interested in the Bulletin to send their suggestions and news addressed to the Editor, "Congress Bulletin" c/o "Young India." Correspondents will please take care to mark all such correspondence for the "Congress Bulletin" in order to save the "Young India" staff from having to handle correspondence intended for the Bulletin. To start with, I would ask every Provincial Congress Committee to send the number of members on its provincial register, the number of village and district organisations, the names and addresses of nationalist newspapers, the number of national educational institutions with the average attendance during the past 6 months, the number of *panchayat* and all other information regarding Non-co-operation activities.

6th October, 1921

HINDUISM

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

In dealing with the problem of untouchability during the Madras tour, I have asserted my claim to being a Sanatani Hindu with greater emphasis than hitherto,

and yet there are things which are commonly done in the name of Hinduism, which I disregard. I have no desire to be called a Sanatani Hindu or any other, if I am not such. And I have certainly no desire to steal in a reform or an abuse under cover of a great faith.

It is therefore necessary for me once for all distinctly to give my meaning of Sanatana Hinduism. The word Sanatana use in its natural sense.

I call myself a Sanatani Hindu, because,

(1) I believe in the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Puranas and all that goes by the name of Hindu scriptures, and therefore in *avataras* and rebirth,

(2) I believe in the *Varnashrama dharma* in a sense in my opinion strictly Vedic, but not in its present popular and crude sense,

(3) I believe in the protection of the cow in its much larger sense than the popular,

(4) I do not disbelieve in idol-worship.

The reader will note that I have purposely refrained from using the word divine origin in reference to the Vedas or any other scriptures. For I do not believe in the exclusive divinity of the Vedas. I believe the Bible, the Koran, and the Zend Avesta to be as much divinely inspired as the Vedas. My belief in the Hindu scriptures does not require me to accept every word and every verse as divinely inspired. Nor do I claim to have any first-hand knowledge of these wonderful books. But I do claim to know and feel the truths of the essential teaching of the scriptures. I decline to be bound by any interpretation, however learned it may be, if it is repugnant to reason or moral sense. I do most emphatically repudiate the claim (if they advance any such) of the present Shankaracharyas and Shastris to give a correct interpretation

of the Hindu scriptures. On the contrary, I believe that our present knowledge of these books is in a most chaotic state. I believe implicitly in the Hindu aphorism, that no one truly knows the Shastras who has not attained perfection in Innocence *(Ahimsa)*, Truth *(Satya)* and Self-control (*Brahmacharya*) and who has not renounced all acquisition or possession of wealth. I believe in the institution of Gurus, but in this age millions must go without a Guru, because it is a rare thing to find a combination of perfect purity and perfect learning. But one need not despair of ever knowing the truth of one's religion, because the fundamentals of Hinduism as of every great religion are unchangeable, and easily understood. Every Hindu believes in God and his Oneness, in rebirth and salvation. But that which distinguishes Hinduism from every other religion is its cow protection, more than its *Varnashrama*.

Varnashrama is, in my opinion, inherent in human nature, and Hinduism has simply reduced it to a science. It does attach to birth. A man cannot change his *varna* by choice. Not to abide by one's *varna* is to disregard the law of heredity. The division, however, into innumerable castes is an unwarranted liberty taken with the doctrine. The four divisions are all-sufficing.

I do not believe, that interdining or even intermarriage necessarily deprives a man of his status that his birth has given him. The four divisions define a man's calling, they do not restrict or regulate social intercourse. The divisions define duties, they confer no privileges. It is, I hold, against the genius of Hinduism to arrogate to oneself a higher status or assign to another a lower. All are born to serve God's creation, a Brahman with his knowledge, a Kshatriya with his power of protection, a

Vaishya with his commercial ability and a Shudra with bodily labour. This, however, does not mean that a Brahman for instance is absolved from bodily labour, or the duty of protecting himself and others. His birth makes a Brahman predominantly a man of knowledge, the fittest by heredity and training to impart it to others. There is nothing, again, to prevent the Shudra from acquiring all the knowledge he wishes. Only, he will best serve with his body and need not envy others their special qualities for service. But a Brahman who claims superiority by right of knowledge falls and has no knowledge. And so with the others who pride themselves upon their special qualities. *Varnashrama* is self-restraint and conservation and economy of energy.

Though therefore *Varnashrama* is not affected by interdining or intermarriage, Hinduism does most emphatically discourage interdining and intermarriage between divisions. Hinduism reached the highest limit of self-restraint. It is undoubtedly a religion of renunciation of the flesh, so that the spirit may be set free. It is no part of a Hindu's duty to dine with his son. And by restricting his choice of a bride to a particular group, he exercises rare self-restraint. Hinduism does not regard a married state as by any means essential for salvation. Marriage is a 'fall' even as birth is a 'fall.' Salvation is freedom from birth and hence death also. Prohibition against intermarriage and interdining is essential for a rapid evolution of the soul. But this self-denial is no test of *varna*. A Brahman may remain a Brahman, though he may dine with his Shudra brother, if he has not left off his duty of service by knowledge. It follows from what I have said above, that restraint in matters of marriage and dinning is not based upon notions of superiority. A Hindu who refuses to dine with another

from a sense of superiority misrepresents his *Dharma*.

Unfortunately to-day, Hinduism seems to consist merely in eating and not eating. Once I horrified a pious Hindu by taking toast at a Mussalman's house. I saw that he was pained to see me pouring milk into a cup handed by a Mussalman friend, but his anguish knew no bounds when he saw me taking toast at the Mussalman's hands. Hinduism is in danger of losing its substance, if it resolves itself into a matter of eleborate rules as to what and with whom to eat. Abstemiousness from intoxicating drinks and drugs, and from all kinds of foods, especially meat, is undoubtedly a great aid to the evolution of the spirit, but it is by no means an end in itself. Many a man eating meat and with everybody, but living in the fear of God is nearer his freedom than a man religiously abstaining from meat and many other things, but blaspheming God in every one of his acts.

The central fact of Hinduism however is cow protection. Cow protection to me is one of the most wonderful phenomena in human evolution. It takes the human being beyond his species. The cow to me means the entire sub-human world. Man through the cow is enjoined to realise his identity with all that lives. Why the cow was selected for apotheosis is obvious to me. The cow was in India the best companion. She was the giver of plenty. Not only did she give milk, but she also made agriculture possible. The cow is a poem of pity. One reads pity in the gentle animal. She is the mother to millions of Indian mankind. Protection of the cow means protection of the whole dumb creation of God. The ancient seer, whoever he was, began with the cow. The appeal of the lower order of creation is all the more forcible because it is speechless.

Cow protection is the gift of Hinduism to the world. And Hinduism will live so long as there are Hindus to protect the cow.

The way to protect is to die for her. It is a denial of Hinduism and *Ahimsa* to kill a human being to protect a cow. Hindus are enjoined to protect the cow by their *tapasya*, by self-purification, by self-sacrifice. The present-day cow protection has degenerated into a perpetual feud with the Mussalmans, whereas cow protection means conquering the Mussalmans by our love. A Mussalman friend sent me some time ago a book detailing the inhumanities practised by us on the cow and her progeny; how we bleed her to take the last drop of milk from her, how we starve her to emaciation, how we ill-treat the calves, how we deprive them of their portion of milk, how cruelly we treat the oxen, how we castrate them, how we beat them, how we overload them. If they had speech, they would bear witness to our crimes against them which would stagger the world. By every act of cruelty to our cattle, we disown God and Hinduism. I do not know that the condition of the cattle in any other part of the world is so bad as in unhappy India. We may not blame the Englishman for this. We may not plead poverty in our defence. Criminal negligence is the only cause of the miserable condition of our cattle. Our *Panjrapoles*, though they are an answer to our instinct of mercy, are a clumsy demonstration of its execution. Instead of being model dairy farms and great profitable national institutions, they are merely depots for receiving decrepit cattle.

Hindus will be judged not by their *tilak*s, not by the correct chanting of *mantras*, not by their pilgrimages, not by their most punctilious observance of caste rules but

by their ability to protect the cow. Whilst professing the religion of cow protection, we have enslaved the cow and her progeny, and have become slaves ourselves.

It will now be understood why I consider myself a Sanatani Hindu. I yield to none in my regard for the cow. I have made the Khilafat cause my own, because I see that through its preservation full protection can be secured for the cow. I do not ask my Mussalman friends to save the cow in consideration of my service. My prayer ascends daily to God Almighty, that my service of a cause I hold to be just may appear so pleasing to Him, that he may change the hearts of the Mussalmans, and fill them with Pity for their Hindu neighbours and make them save the animal the latter hold dear as life itself.

I can no more describe my feeling for Hinduism than for my own wife. She moves me as no other woman in the world can. Not that she has no faults; I daresay, she has many more than I see myself. But the feeling of an indissoluble bond is there. Even so I feel for and about Hinduism with all its faults and limitations. Nothing elates me so much as the music of the Gita or the Ramayana by Tulasidas, the only two books in Hinduism I may be said to know. When I fancied I was taking my last breath, the Gita was my solace. I know the vice that is going on to-day in all the great Hindu shrines, but I love them in spite of their unspeakable failings. There is an interest which I take in them and which I take in no other. I am a reformer through and through. But my zeal never takes me to the rejection of any of the essential things of Hinduism. I have said I do not disbelieve in idol worship. An idol does not excite any feeling of veneration in me. But I think that idol worship is part of human nature. We hanker after

symbolism. Why should one be more composed in a church than elsewhere? Images are an aid to worship. No Hindu considers an image to be God. I do not consider idol whorship a sin.

It is clear from the foregoing, that Hinduism is not an exclusive religion. In it there is room for the worship of all the prophets of the world. It is not a missionary religion in the ordinary sense of the term. It has no doubt absorbed many tribes in its fold, but this absorption has been of an evolutionary, imperceptible character. Hinduism tells every one to worship God according to his own faith or *Dharma,* and so it lives at peace with all the religions.

That being my conception of Hinduism, I have never been able to reconcile myself to untouchability. I have always regarded it as an excrescence. It is true that it has been handed down to us from generations, but so are many evil practices even to this day. I should be ashamed to think that dedication of girls to virtual prostitution was a part of Hinduism. Yet it is practised by Hindus in many parts of India. I consider it positive irreligion to sacrifice goats to Kali and do not consider it a part of Hinduism. Hinduism is a growth of ages. The very name, Hinduism, was given to the religion of the people of Hindusthan by foreigners. There was no doubt at one time sacrifice of animals offered in the name of religion. But it is not religion, much less is it Hindu religion. And so also, it seems to me that when cow protection became an article of faith with our ancestors, those who persisted in eating beef were excommunicated. The civil strife must have been fierce. Social boycott was applied not only to the recalcitrants, but their sins were visited upon their children also. The practice which had probably its

origin in good intentions hardened into usage, and even verses crept in our sacred books giving the practice a permanence wholly undeserved and still less justified. Whether my theory is correct or not, untouchability is repugnant to reason and to the instinct of mercy, pity or love. A religion that establishes the worship of the cow cannot possibly countenance or warrant a cruel and inhuman boycott of human beings. And I should be content to be torn to pieces rather than disown the suppressed classes. Hindus will certainly never deserve freedom, nor get it if they allow their noble religion to be disgraced by the retention of the taint of untouchability. And as I love Hinduism dearer than life itself, the taint has become for me an intolerable burden. Let us not deny God by denying to a fifth of our race the right of association on an equal footing.

29th Sevtember, 1920

THE MEANING OF THE EMPIRE

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The following circular has been issued by the Education Department:

"Teachers and Educational officers of this Presidency should be asked to co-operate in bringing about a right understanding of the meaning of the Empire and in dispelling the idea that the Empire is based on force and militarism, by encouraging the parties concerned to look upon each other as brethren in advancement of the liberal aims and mutual friendship and sympathy particularly in India where a contrary feeling is gaining ground."

It is dated at Poona, the 1st instant.

The circular in my opinion is a triumph of Non-co-operation. We have been often told authoritatively that the Empire is based finally on force. When an attempt is being made to isolate this force, and to shew by not meeting it by force that it is utterly useless when it is not backed by the co-operation, conscious or unconscious, of the people, we have a circular calling upon the teachers to co-operate in showing that the Empire is based not on force of militarism, but that it is based on mutual friendship. This I consider a triumph of Non-co-operation, because force recedes into the background. Sir Michael O'Dwyer flaunted his brute force in the face of the nation, and terrorism reigned supreme for a time. It did not answer. Now it is to be covered under soft-sounding phrases. It too must fail.

The circular is hypocritical. The talk of friendship and sympathy between terrorists and their victims is to add deception to tyranny. The way out is through Non-co-operation.

It is a vain attempt to expect to secure friendship by false pretentions. The best and only way to secure the real friendship of the people and to prove to them that the Empire is not based on force and militarism, is to withdraw the superfluous military force even at the risk of losing the Empire, to trust the people, and for Englishmen in general to regard us in every way their equals in thought and in deed. This presupposes righting the Khilafat wrong in accordance with the Mussalman sentiment and to give full reparation regarding the Punjab.

But this seems impossible for the general body of Englishmen to do. They have been brought up to work upon us as mere chattels. I invite the attention of the reader to the account of the treatment of our countrymen

in New Zealand. I cannot conceive anything more wantonly brutal than the doings of the whitemen of New Zealand. It is not as if the colonists are a depraved people. They are brave, generous, charitable and cultured in their own sphere: But they are thrown off their balance immediately they come in contact with us. We are their natural prey. And culture is no bar to their maltreatment of us, even as culture is no bar to the killing even say of snakes by the majority of mankind. I have not used a far-fetched illustration. Thousands of Englishmen cannot bear the idea of an Indian claiming or living on terms of equality with them. White superiority, as Mr. Andrews has shown, has become a religion. President Kruger used to say that God had ordained Asiatics to be white men's slaves. He even introduced the idea in his statute book. He was frank and he avowed it. Others believe it, practise it, but would fain break its force by using euphemistic language or worse.

It is not possible to blame anybody but ourselves for this badge of inferiority, and we alone can remove it by supreme effort.

23rd March, 1921

'FOR GOD, KING AND COUNTRY'

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

During my peregrinations I once came across boys in uniform and asked them what their uniform meant. I observed that their uniform was made of foreign cloth or cloth woven out of foreign yarn. They said it was scouts' uniform. They whetted my curiosity by the answer. I was eager to know what they did as scouts. The answer was that they lived for God, King, and

Country, 'Who is your King?' I asked. 'King George,' was the reply. 'How about Jallianwala? Supposing you had been in that place on the 13th April 1919, and were asked by General Dyer to shoot your terrified countrymen, what would you have done?'

'Of course I would not have obeyed the command.'

'But General Dyer wore the King's uniform?'

'Yes, but he belongs to the bureaucracy, and I have nothing to do with it.'

I suggested that he could not separate the bureaucracy from the King, that the King was an impersonal ideal existence which meant the British Empire and that no Indian could remain loyal, in the accepted sense, to the Empire as it was at present represented and be loyal to God at the same time. An Empire, which could be responsible for the terrorism of the Martial Law regime, that would not repent of the wrong, that could enter into secret treaties in breach of solemn obligations, could only be reckoned as a godless Empire. Loyalty to such an Empire was disloyalty to God.

The boy was puzzled.

I continued my argument. 'Supposing our country becomes godless in order to enrich itself, exploits other people, trafficks in intoxicants, goes to war for the sake of extending its trade and resorts to fraud in order to sustain its power and prestige, how can we be consistently loyal to God and country? Must we not forsake the country for the sake of God? I suggest, therefore, that you should bind yourself to be faithful and loyal only to God and none else in the same sense and in the same breath.'

There were many of his companions who were deeply interested in the conversation. Their chief too came in. I repeated my argument to him and asked him to tax

himself and stimulate the inquiring spirit of the grown up young men whom he was guiding. Hardly was the absorbing topic exhausted, when the train steamed out of the station. I felt sorry for the splendid lads and understood better the deep meaning of the movement of Non-co-operation. There can be but one universal creed for man, that is loyalty to God. It includes, when it is not inconsistent, loyalty to King, country, and humanity. But it equally often excludes all else. I hope that the youth of the country as well as their tutors will revise their creed and set themselves right where they are convinced of their error. It is no small matter for tender minds to have formulas presented to them which cannot bear scrutiny.

27th April, 1921

THE CURSE OF BETTING

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

"You will earn the gratitude and thanks of thousands of wives, both European and Indian, if you can succeed in putting a stop to betting at the races. My husband was an ideal husband—until he took to betting at the races. We are now in debt, and, although he draws a good salary and does not drink alcohol, we are hard up, and I am sure this is the experience of very many wives. I have often implored him on my bended knees not to go to the races but to no purpose. And does it not seem very hard that wives and children should suffer because their husbands cannot refrain from going to the races and losing money?

"It is true that alcohol is ruining thousands, but betting at the races is certainly ruining tens of thousands.

"By practically robbing the public, the W. I. T. Club can afford to pay its European employees handsome salaries. If you were only in the know, I am sure you would agree with me that hanky-panky tricks are carried on by the Turf Club, and thus, the public are cheated and robbed of a lot of money. Do, for God's sake, try, and right matters. Things were certainly better when the book-makers were allowed to take bets on the race-course.

"Sir, I am sure you are acquainted with a number of men on the new Councils, and, with their aid, I do hope you will succeed in putting a stop to betting at the races. If Government would take over and manage the totes, I am sure, things would be more fair and square. The public invariably lose and those who win are the owners of horses and their trainers and jockeys; and is it not a scandalous shame that Government should connive at it, simply because some of their big officials are keenly interested in horse racing?

"I had better not offer my signature to this letter as my husband is in Government service; but I pray that you will interest yourself in what I have written and succeed in stopping betting at the races."

This letter has been travelling with me for some time. The reader will share my feelings that it is a pathetic letter. Anonymous letters are rarely valuable. But this one is certainly an exception, though the writer has chosen not to disclose her name.

I know nothing of horse- racing. I have ever looked upon it with horror for its associations. I know that many men have been ruined on the race course.

But I must confess I have not had the courage to write anything against it. Having seen even an Aga Khan, prelates, viceroys, and those that are considered the

best in the land, openly patronising it and spending thousands upon it, I have felt it to be useless to write about it.* As a journalist and reformer, my function is

* The following also appeared in *Young India* :

The Curse of Betting.—Babu Bhagwandas, the learned chancellor of the National University, Kashi, has sent me extracts from Manusmriti on the sin of betting. I reproduce them below :

"The King should diligently keep gambling (*dyuta*) and betting (*samahvaya*) away from the state; for these two vices destroy the State and the sovereign themselves. (221)

Gambling and betting are indeed as daylight robbery; and the ruler should endeavour diligently to eradicate them. (222)

That wherein inanimate things are used, that is *dyuta*, gambling; that, wherein living things are used, that is *samahvaya*, betting. (223)

He who does these himself, or causes them to be done by others, secretly or openly, may be punished by the ruler with punishment up to that of death, at the ruler's discretion, like cheats and impersonators pretending to follow vocations other than their rightful ones. Or gamblers and betters (*kitawah*) may be banished from the land, like those who practise prostitution under cover of dancing and singing and acting, or those who make and sell spirituous liquors and other such cruel deceivers and spreaders of vice and followers of sinful trades. (224-228).—26th May, 1921 :

Satya wrote under date 25th May, 1921 :

I am glad, *Young India* and its Editor have taken up the question of the evils of betting. I feel, however, that a casual article in *Young India* is not enough to root out this evil, imported from the west. The evil has spread from the idle rich to the commercial communities, the middle classes, the labourers working in factories, and the schoolboy. Over and above thousands of people regularly going to the Races week after week, there are thousands more, to whom temptation to gamble comes in the shape of bucket-shops, openly plying their trade in the heart of the city. The Government have appointed a committee to consider the question of closing down these shops, and they will have some Legislation at the next sessions. But that is not enough. Public opinion must be created, and it must be definitely shown that race-going and betting is as bad as drinking and prostitution. For this, a strong agitation is required, and I hope, readers of *Young India* will respond to it.

to call public attention to these vices about which there likelihood of public opinion being created. Much as disapprove of vaccination, I deem it to be waste of effort to draw public attention to the evil. I must own that I had not the courage to bring the drink traffic in the campaign of purification. It has come unsought. The people have taken it up of their own accord.

The surest sign that Non-co-operation is a movement of purification is that many abuses are being removed by the people without any guidance or preaching. And it is in such hope about betting that I have published the above letter.

I am aware that the writer would be satisfied merely with some modification. What is required is a total destruction of the pest. Betting at races is a part of the gambling mania. If only the people will Non-co-operate, the evil will die a natural death. Thousands who attend the race course do so merely for fun. They attend either to see horses run breathlessly, or because it is the fashion, but they, nevertheless, aid and abet the ruin of many a gambler.

But betting is, I apprehend, more dicffiult to deal with than drinking. When vice becomes a fashion and even a virtue, it is a long process to deal with it. Betting is not only fashionable but is hardly regarded as a vice. Not so drinking. Fortunately, it is still the fashion to

---

Mr. Gandhi replied as follows in *Young India* of 22nd June, 1921 :

As I have already said, unfortunately the races and gambling in connection therewith are fashionable. They do not excite the same feeling of shame that drinking does. Race-going, therefore, is more difficult to deal with than drinking. 'Satya' knows the evils of race-going in a special manner. I invite him to come out in the open, and personally tackle the vice which is slowly but surely undermining the morals of society.

consider drinking a weakness, if not positively a vice. Every religion has denounced it with more or less vehemence. But betting has escaped much special attention. Let us hope however that the vigilant public will find a more innocent recreation than attending the race course, and thus show its disapproval of gambling at the race course.

PART VII
CONGRESS AND SWARAJ

PART VII

CONGRESS AND SWARAJ

7th January, 1920

THE CONGRESS

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

THE Congress this time was for many of us a pilgrimage because of its having been held in Amritsar. Jallianwala Bagh was visited during the Congress * week by the thousands of delegates and visitors with the pilgrim mind. It is said that some touched the blood-stained earth with their foreheads, some took away with them a little of that earth to be preserved as a sacred treasure. Some used it as *vibhuti*, and smeared their foreheads with it. All went to the Bagh as a sacred duty. There is no doubt many went to the Congress only as a mark of their respect for the memory of the innocent dead.

The speeches of Swami Shri Shraddhanandji, the Chairman of the Reception Committee, and of the Hon'ble Pandit Motilal Nehru were models of sobriety and breathed an earnest spirit. Each bore the individuality of its author. The Swami's had a religious ring about it. He was full of good-will towards mankind. "How can we hate Englishmen if we love Andrews,

* The Session of the Congress held at Amritsar in December, 1919.

Wedderburn, Hume, Hardinge and others? We must conquer the English with our love," said the Swami. The Pandit's language, though perfectly courteous and restrained, is bitter. He compels a tear from the eye as he takes you with him through the different acts of the Punjab tragedy. He has examined the events of the Punjab with his legal acumen. Iron has entered his soul. He demands stern justice against the culprits.

The Presidential speech suffers for being in English. It was painful to see him labouring through his speech, spoken in a foreign tongue before an audience of nearly 15,000 people, not one-seventh of which could follow his English. The Congress proceedings have conclusively demonstrated the necessity of their being mainly, if not entirely, conducted in Hindi. That is the only course left open to us, if we would work for the masses and draw upon them for delegates. In the Central Provinces, the United Provinces, Delhi, the Punjab and Behar, only Hindustani is spoken and in all the other parts of India except the Presidency of Madras, Hindi can be generally understood. For it is a language cognate to the vernaculars of the other provinces. Madras alone presents any difficulty and for the sake of a few hundred delegates from that Presidency, it would not be proper to do violence to thousands who cannot understand English, but who can more or less understand Hindustani. The only straight, economical and politically sound course is to make the proceedings of the Congress predominantly Hindustani, the Dravidian members being free to speak in English, or for that matter, in Tamil or Telegu. I grant that for a few years the Subjects Committee must deliberate in English, but if we are to give a proper political education to the country through the medium of the Congress,

it must be clear to every one that it can only be done through Hindi. I trust, therefore, that those in the Madras Presidency who are desirous of doing All-India public work outside their Presidency and of aspiring after becoming delegates of the Congress will make haste to learn Hindi. They have got facilities in the Madras Presidency for learning Hindi, and if they will begin now and give at least one hour per day regularly to it, they will, by the end of the year, be able generally to follow the proceedings of the Congress. All must recognise that the insistent demand of the delegates from year to year for Hindustani cannot be resisted for any length of time.

Another absurdity which is becoming more and more grave needs also to be removed. Very few people could follow the President while he was reading his speech. The very best of leaders may not occupy the attention of the audience for longer than an hour. The President's address was necessarily long. It occupied thirty-eight foolscap pages in print. Fortunately Pandit Nehru skipped over many pages whilst he was reading it, but he would have taken no less than three hours if he had insisted on reading the whole of the thirty-eight pages. It is highly necessary, therefore, that the addresses of the Chairman of the Reception Committee and the President should be printed in Hindustani (both in Devanagri and Urdu scripts), English and the vernacular of the province in which the Congress is held, and distributed at the entrance either gratis or for the cost price. They ought not to be distributed in the pandal, as is often done much to the inconvenience of everybody. Both the Chairman and the President might read or orally give the summary of their addresses, each occupying no longer than thirty minutes.

The third absurdity is the terrible, evergrowing waste of money in creating a huge pandal. The Indian climate admits of holding meetings in the open air. But I refrain from saying more on this matter as the All-India Congress Committee has appointed a sub- committee consisting of Messrs. Kelkar, I. B. Sen, A. Rangaswami Iyengar, the Hon'ble V. J. Patel and myself to consider the whole constitution of the Congress.

The resolutions of the Congress show that there are very sharp divisions and as time goes forward, parties are inevitable. Hitherto the Congress has represented only one party, but it cannot be kept any longer as one party organisation, if it is not to have seceders from it on an increasing scale from year to year. Measures must be devised whereby all parties can be represented on it and the annual assembly can retain its truly national character.

Let us consider the resolutions. Take the condemnation of the excesses. There is no doubt that without that resolution some of the resolutions would have lost all force and value. We could not with any justification condemn the excesses of the authorities and therefore urge the dismissal of General Dyer or Sir Michael O' Dwyer, or even the Viceroy's recall, if we were not ready to condemn our own. That resolution was the necessary *prayaschitta* for the mob frenzy in April. If we are to make orderly progress, we must unequivocally disapprove of violence being committed by the people in any shape or form. It is true that often in the West mob violence is resorted to, but by creating a strong popular opinion against it, we must make such violence impossible in India. Few can deny that on the sixth of April India found itself in possession of a new force and a new power—a force that could prove irresistible under

almost every conceivable circumstance provided that truth was on our side. It is my firm belief that had the development of Satyagraha not been interrupted in April by our own folly, not only would the Rowlatt Act have been removed from the Statute Book but we would have been spared the humiliating and degrading spectacle of a British general running amuck. Indeed we shall find it impossible, when we have full control over our national affairs, to carry on the government of the country without self-restraint. In a vast country like India where the people are ordinarily peaceful, we shall find it impossible to carry on the government if mob rule becomes the custom of the land, and in order to check that tendency, popular opinion is a far greater and more potent instrument than the employment of physical force. I would, therefore, give the first place in point of importance to this resolution as a token of the correctness of our conduct and for the sake of a lead to the country. These resolutions of the Congress, especially those that require any action on the part of the people, are valuable for the formation of public opinion, and I hope that workers recognizing the full force of the truth underlying the resolution will on due occasion impress upon the people the necessity of refraining from violence.

Only less in importance than the resolution on condemnation was the resolution on Reforms.* Whilst

* *Young India* of 14th January contained the following:

The Reforms Resolution in the Congress.—The Reforms Resolution has been the subject of much criticism in the Press and it may be interesting to summarise the criticism here briefly. The "Servant of India" is of opinion that the Congress failed to give the lead to the country mainly because of the "essential weakness of Mr. Gandhi's position" that he did not set out to examine in detail the Reform Act as Mrs. Besant did. Mrs. Besant in a leading article in "New India" charges Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Malaviaji with not having stood firmly

I subscribe entirely to the proposition that India is fit now for responsible government, I do not for one moment believe that we can get it without working for it. We can work either by adopting obstructive tactics or by co-operation. Healthy obstruction is a condition of our being. We must ever obstruct untruth, injustice and

---

by their first amendment, and says that had they done so, "they would have carried it, for Mr. Tilak had told his followers to yield at the last moment." She has no doubt that Mr. Tilak is using Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Malaviaji as tools as three years ago she says he was using her in a similar way. The "Leader" is of opinion that the Resolution means practically a victory for the "Super extremists" and that the resolution as it was passed in its final form "does not at all events bring out clearly the sense the extremists would co-operate with the authorities in making the Reforms a success." It complains that, after emphatically explaining the plain connotation of the word "disappointing", Mr. Gandhi failed to stick to his amendment and the result was that a compromise clause was at last added, which differed in no wise from Mr. Pal's amendment and of course Mr. Pal made no secret of his attitude in that in moving the amendment he did, he only made light of the idea of co-operation and almost jeered the idea of thanking Mr. Montagu. The "Leader" is clear that "Messrs Pal, Das, and Satyamurti had their way and Mr. Gandhi must acknowledge that he including Pandit Malaviya and Mr. Jinnah were defeated."

In refreshing contrast with these opinions is that of the "Times of India." It will be remembered that before the Resolution had been passed at the Congress the paper had expressed the opinion that the "doctrine preached at Amritsar is for all practical purposes the doctrine of disunion." After the acceptance of the Resolution, it seems to be satisfied that the party which "desired to use the Reforms whole-heartedly for the advancement of the country, in the confident knowledge that good work will quicker bring the expansion of responsible institutions," substantially prevailed in the end. It adds that the exact wording of the amendment is immaterial, and that haulting though the final Resolution was, "it was in the right direction" and "the main and important fact is that the Congress pledged itself openly to do, what in fact all had made up their minds to do, namely, to co-operate in the Reforms."

The comment on the above appears on page 826 of this volume.

evil. It was because I did not consider, and do not consider, the Reforms to be an evil or unjust and because I consider them to be a progressive step towards responsible government, that I decline to consider them to be disappointing, however inadequate and unsatisfactory they may be. I endorse Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal's opinion that for me to decline to consider the Reforms disappointing means that I did not expect them. I had certainly much fear that the Roforms might not go through when they did and I was unprepared for material improvements in the measure as it was originally published. The opponents of the amendment admitted that they would co-operate when co-operation was essential for the country's good and not hesitate to obstruct when obstruction advanced it. That no doubt was the only meaning, and no other, of the amendment of which I had the honour to be in charge. But let it be said to the credit of the opponents that they resisted the amendment as long as they could, because they frankly said that they had a faith in the bureaucracy even under the altered conditions. In my humble opinion, it is a wrong attitude. The Royal Proclamation has been framed in a most liberal spirit. It is full of good-will and it would have been wrong on the part of the Congress not to have responded to the King's call for co-operation. My faith in human nature is irrepressible, and even under the circumstances of a most adverse character, I have found Englishmen amenable to reason and persuasion, and as they always wish to appear to be just even when they are in reality unjust, it is easier to shame them than others into doing the right thing. Be that however as it may, it would be a fall from our culture and it would be unwise not to grasp the hand of fellowship extended through the Proclamation. If we are strong, we shall lose nothing by

beginning with co-operation. We at once place the bureaucracy in the wrong by our readiness to co-operate for the common purpose.

It was equally important for us to thank Mr. Montagu for his valuable services in connection with the Reforms. The Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Mr. Jinnah and I therefore felt that even at the risk of dividing the house we were bound to press the amendment home. That ultimately there was a compromise shows the good nature of Lokamanya Tilak and Mr. Das. It was a perfect pleasure to see both of them, whilst holding to their views, anxious not to divide the house. And it was equally a pleasure to see so many on the platform working to secure a compromise.

14th January, 1920

THE REFORMS RESOLUTION IN THE CONGRESS

The divergence of views on the Reforms Resolution, summarised in one of our notes*, is not to be wondered at. Compromises never give complete satisfaction to all parties. In their very nature they must just fall short of that and yet be acceptable to all. In our opinion, the country did get the lead through the Congress that it was possible to give it. The Congress must, if it is to serve the country, more and more tend to represent not one view but many and, that not merely in the Subjects Committee, but on the open platform. There is no denying the fact there are several parties in the country. Extremist and Moderate do not cover all parties. There are, for instance, in the extremist camp Mr. Kasturiranga Iyengar's, Mr. Das', and Lokamanya Tilak's parties.

**See* page 823.

No doubt they sailed under the extremist flag. But as differences become accentuated, as they must be in course of time, each group will begin to assert itself. The Hon. Pandit Malaviaji represents a body of opinion distinct from the Extremist. Similarly in the Moderate camp there are undoubtedly divisions, which as time goes on will become sharper, rather than otherwise, and *with a proper constitution* there is no reason why the Congress should not represent a resultant of all these different views *thrashed out with calmness and becoming dignity on* the Congress platform. For the first time in the history of the Congress, an open and reasoned discussion took place before the delegates, on a matter of the greatest importance to the country, and for the first time were those elaborate preparations made in order to ascertain by their votes the decision of the Congress. That in itself in our opinion was something worth attaining. But there was more than this. No doubt it was open to either party to push the matter to a division. We cannot accept Mrs. Besant's view that L. Tilak had told his followers to vote for Mr. Gandhi's amendment if he had held out, and even if Mrs. Besant's information is correct, it would hardly have been proper for Mr. Gandhi to have pushed the matters to such an extreme. His amendment alone brought forth Mr. Pal's. The latter was a purely tactical move. Had the audience been called upon merely to decide between the original proposition, *i.e.*, without co-operation and thanks, and Mr. Gandhi's, with thanks, a division would have been a duty. But Mr. Pal's amendment came as a feeler and also was an earnest of the extremist groups to conciliate an opposing amendment, so long as they could consistently do so. Mr. Pal's amendment could not be accepted because of the offensive

word 'use' in it. Naturally therefore a third amendment providing a middle course had to be framed and comfort lies not merely in the fact of the compromise but in the fact that all were anxious to avoid an open division. Surely for the country, it means that the Congress desires to co-operate with the authorities in so far as that co-operation can hasten the advent of the responsible government, and to thank Mr. Montagu for his valuable labours on the reforms. We would certainly have liked it better if the graceful language of the original amendment had been accepted, if thanks had been expressed in warmer terms and extended to Lord Sinha. But it would have been wrong to divide the house after the principle of co-operation and thanks was granted by the three leaders. We are unable to associate ourselves with the suggestion that L. Tilak in accepting the amendment wanted to use Messrs. Malaviya and Gandhi as his tools, and if they allowed themselves to be so used, it would not be the Lokamanya who would be to blame, but Messrs Malaviya and Gandhi would be clearly held blameworthy for their simplicity. For, as party formation progresses, we suppose it would be considered quite the proper thing for party leaders to use others as tools so long as there are any to be used. Care will therefore have to be taken rather to purify our politics, than for fear of being used as tools to hesitate to take the right course. L. Tilak represents a definite school of thought of which he makes no secret. He considers that everything is fair in politics. We have joined issue with him in that conception of political life. We consider that political life of the country will become thoroughly corrupt, if we import western tactics and methods. We believe that nothing but the strictest adherence to honesty, fairplay and charity can advance

the true interests of the country. But we refuse, because of the essential difference just pointed out, to believe that in accepting the amendment L. Tilak was guided by any motive other than that of meeting his opponents' views so far as it was possible. On the whole, therefore, in our opinion, the analysis given by the *Times of India* is the only true analysis of the position ultimately arrived at under the compromise.

15th September, 1920

THE CONGRESS

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Never has the Congress* been called upon to decide an issue so momentous as the one it was called upon to decide at its special session, presided over by Lala Lajpat Rai. Never perhaps has the Congress witnessed such determined opposition as was offered to the Non-co-operation resolution. And yet never, within my experience, has a decisive majority listened with such respect and attention to the opposition argument as it did at the last session. Again never has there been such united opposition shown to a Subjects Committee resolution by the noted leaders of the people.

Mrs. Besant has a fine record of service to India. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviyaji is a name to conjure with. He has to his credit an unbroken record of many years' brilliant service to the country and an unblemished character. Mr. Das leads a party ever growing in influence and strength. I felt the late Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak's absence most keenly at such a juncture. Mr. Baptista led the Deccan. Mr. Kasturi Ranga

* Special Congress held at Calcutta.

Aiyengar, the talented editor of the *Hindu*, led the Madras Nationalist party. All these and many other leaders strenuously opposed the Non-co-operation resolution. I warned that great audience against accepting my proposal, unless they were prepared to suffer and were convinced that true Non-co-operation was possible only through the programme submitted by me. But the audience wanted action, wanted suffering. The voting was elaborately registered. The Congress pandal was cleared for the purpose of voting. Lala Lajpat Rai personally superintended the operation. It lasted for six hours. All the provinces but the Central Provinces and the Berars voted in favour of my resolution. The Central Provinces gave for my proposition 30 votes as against 33 for Babu Bipin Chandra Pal's. I give the figures below.

		For Res.	For Amendment
Bombay	...	243	93
Madras	...	161	135
Bengal	...	551	395
U. P.	...	259	28
Punjab	...	254	92
Andhra	...	59	12
Sindh	...	36	16
Delhi	...	59	9
Behar	...	184	28
Burma	...	14	4
C. P.	...	30	33
Berar	...	5	28
		1855	873

My resolution adopted the principle of the whole of the Khilafat Programme, even non-payment of taxes, and advised for immediate adoption, boycott of titles

and honorary offices, law courts by litigants, schools and colleges and reformed councils. Babu Bipin Chandra Pal proposed a mission to England to present our demands and meanwhile to establish national Schools, formulate arbitration courts and not to boycott the councils. His resolution would have meant in effect seeking election to the councils, and these probably adopting obstructive tactics. This meant a virtual postponement of the real struggle to the next general election. The opposition therefore chiefly centred on the boycott of councils. And the Congress has decided by an overwhelming majority that the councils must be abandoned. I hope that those who do not believe that boycott of councils would postpone the attainment of Swarajya (let alone hastening it) will work with all their might to advance the purpose of the Congress.

An analysis of the votes shows that the country wants Non-co-operation. Mrs. Besant who consistently, fearlessly and frankly opposed it had very few adherents. I do not propose to examine the merits of the case at the present moment. My argument is before the country in favour of boycott of councils, schools and courts. Nothing I heard on the Congress platform has shaken my belief in the necessity or the efficacy of these steps. But I would respectfully address a few words to the majority and to the minority.

To the majority I would say: The hour of the greatest triumph is the hour of the greatest humility. The majority has taken upon its shoulders a tremendous responsibility. Every individual voter in favour of my proposal has certainly bound himself, if he is a parent, to withdraw his children from schools or colleges subject in any way to Government control. Every voter being a lawyer is bound at the earliest

opportunity to suspend his practice and promote the cause of settlement of disputes by private arbitration. Every candidate for the Councils, who has voted with the majority, has undertaken to withdraw his candidature, every such voter, to refrain from voting at the elections. Every delegate voting with the majority has bound himself to stimulate hand-spinning and hand-weaving and in his own person to use only hand-spun and hand-woven cloth. Everyone of the majority having accepted the principle of Non-violence, self-sacrifice and discipline in regard to Non-co-operation is bound to treat the minority with respect and fairness. We may not use physical or wordy violence against them. We must endeavour by our intensive practice and by scrupulously honourable methods to convert it to our views. Those who voted with the minority were either weak or not ready. Some few doubted the rightness of withdrawing children from schools for instance. But when they see schools being emptied, national schools springing into being, lawyers suspending practice and yet not starving, and the councils deserted at least by the best of nationalists, they will soon begin to believe in the programme, lose their weakness and be themselves ready to adopt it. We need not therefore be impatient with the minority, because it does not see eye to eye with us.

To the minority, I would say, they have lost in a fair fight. Unless now therefore it is a matter of conscience with them, they must come forward to prosecute the programme of Non-co-operation in a most vigorous manner. Those who think that the majority has grievously erred are no doubt entitled to carry on a campaign of conversion of the majority to their views. By far the largest number in the minority, however, have

accepted the principle of establishment of private arbitration-courts and national schools. They wanted only a postponement of the boycott of councils. I venture to suggest to them that now that the majority has decided in favour of a quicker pace, the minority should accept the verdict and help to make the programme a success.

Boycott of foreign goods finds a place in my resolution. I am sorry for it. I may not state how it came to find a place there. But as it did not conflict with my conscience, and in order to show my reasonableness, I undertook to move a resolution whose musical harmony was marred by a false note. Boycott of foreign cloth is included in Swadeshi. Boycott of all other foreign goods is a senseless proposition, if only because it is a virtual impossibility. But if the introduction of the addendum stimulates us to sacrifice our luxuries and superfluities, it would have served a good purpose. It is certainly our right and duty to discard everything foreign that is superfluous and even everything foreign that is *necessary*, if we can produce or manufacture it in our country.

3rd November, 1920

THE CONGRESS CONSTITUTION

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The belated report of the Congress Constitution Committee has now been published for general information, and opinion has been invited from all public bodies in order to assist the deliberations of the All-India Congress Committee. It is a pity that, small though the Constitution Committee was, all the members never met at any one time in spite of efforts to have a meeting of them all.

It is perhaps nobody's fault that all the members could not meet. At the same time, the draft report has passed through the searching examination of all but one member, and the report represents the mature deliberations of four out of the five members. It must be stated at the same time that it does not pretend to be the unanimous opinion of the members. Rather than present a dissenting minute, a workable scheme has been brought out leaving each member free to press his own views on the several matters in which they are not quite unanimous. The most important part of the constitution, however, is the alteration of the creed. So far as I am aware, there is no fundamental difference of opinion between the members. In my opinion, the altered creed represents the exact feeling of the country at the present moment.

I know that the proposed alteration has been subjected to hostile criticism in several newspapers of note. But the extraordinary situation that faces the country is that popular opinion is far in advance of several newspapers which have hitherto commanded influence and have undoubtedly moulded public opinion. The fact is that the formation of opinion to-day is by no means confined to the educated classes, but the masses have taken it upon themselves not only to formulate opinion but to enforce it. It would be a mistake to belittle or ignore this opinion, or to ascribe it to a temporary upheaval. It would be equally a mistake to suppose that this awakening amongst the masses is due either to the activity of the Ali Brothers or myself. For the time being we have the ear of the masses because we voice their sentiments. The masses are by no means so foolish or unintelligent as we sometimes imagine. They often perceive things with their intuition, which we ourselves fail to see with our intellect. But whilst the masses

know what they want, they often do not know how to express their wants and, less often, how to get what they want. Herein comes the use of leadership, and disastrous results can easily follow a bad, hasty, or what is worse, selfish lead.

The first part of the proposed creed expresses the present desire of the nation, and the second shows the way that desire can be fulfilled. In my humble opinion, the Congress creed with the proposed alteration is but an extension of the original. And so long as no break with the British connection is attempted, it is strictly within even the existing article that defines the Congress Creed. The extension lies in the contemplated possibility of a break with the British connection. In my humble opinion, if India is to make unhampered progress, we must make it clear to the British people that, whilst we desire to retain the British connection, if we can rise to our full height with it, we are determined to dispense with, and even to get rid of that connection, if that is necessary for full national development. I hold that it is not only derogatory to national dignity, but it actually impedes national progress superstitiously to believe that our progress towards our goal is impossible without British connection. It is this superstition which makes some of the best of us tolerate the Punjab wrong and the Khilafat insult. This blind adherence to that connection makes us feel helpless. The proposed alteration in the creed enables us to rid ourselves of our helpless condition. I personally hold that it is perfectly constitutional openly to strive after independence, but lest there may be dispute as to the constitutional character of any movement for complete independence, the doubtful and highly technical adjective "constitutional" has been removed from the altered creed in the draft.

Surely it should be enough to ensure that the methods for achieving our end are legitimate, honourable, and peaceful. I believe that this was the reasoning that guided my colleagues in accepting the proposed creed. In any case, such was certainly my view of the whole alteration. There is no desire on my part to adopt any means that are subversive of law and order. I know, however, that I am treading on delicate ground when I write about law and order; for, to some of our distinguished leaders even my present methods appear to be lawless and conducive to disorder. But even they will, perhaps, grant that the retention of the word 'constitutional' cannot protect the country against methods such as I am employing. It gives rise, no doubt, to a luminous legal discussion, but any such discussion is fruitless when the nation means business. The other important alteration refers to the limitation of the number of delegates. I believe that the advantages of such a limitation are obvious. We are fast reaching a time when without any such limitation the Congress will become an unwieldy body. It is difficult even to have an unlimited number of visitors; it is impossible to transact national business, if we have an unlimited number of delegates.

The next important alteration is about the election of the members of the All-India Congress Committee making that committee practically the Subjects Committee, and the redistribution of India for the purposes of the Congress on a linguistic basis. It is not necessary to comment on these alterations, but I wish to add that, if the Congress accepts the principle of limiting the number of delegates, it would be advisable to introduce the principle of proportional representation. That would enable all parties, who wish to be represented at the Congress.

I observe that the *Servant of India* sees an inconsistency between my implied acceptance of the British Committee so far as the published draft constitution is concerned, and my recent article in "Young India" on that Committee* and the newspaper *India*. But it is well-known

* The following appeared in *Young India* of 20th October, 1920:

I gladly reproduce in another column an open letter sent to me by Miss Normanton. (Here omitted) I do not know the lady save by her writings in "India" whilst it was being edited by her. Her views on Non-co-operation are refreshingly strong and her unqualified support of the boycott of the reformed Councils ought to prove consoling to the waverers. But I would ask my reader not to overweigh the effect of the boycott on the British public or the League of Nations. It is better for us to rivet our attention on our own duty irrespective of the effect of its performance on outside opinion. We have over-estimated the effect of our action on British public opinion and in doing so have often damaged the true interests of the nation. At the same time, Miss Normanton's argument appears to me to be perfectly sound,

What will however interest the public more are perhaps her views on the British Committee. I do not know the merits of the controversy she discusses. But apart from the merits, her views on the constitution of the Committee would appear to be original. I entirely associate myself with her remark that a British Committee, to be true to the name, should be composed exclusively of the British people and financed by them. It is then more likely to exert influence on British public opinion than now.

In any case, we would then have a real index of the British interest in Indian affairs. I endorse Miss Normanton's views about the newspaper "India" also. The paper costs much more than it is worth. Its influence on English opinion is practically nothing and it is an indifferent vehicle of English opinion for India's enlightenment. Its only value therefore consists in its parliamentary reports which can be received and distributed by the All-India Congress Committee with very little cost. An enterprising newspaper could take over that duty any day and make it a paying venture. And now that we have embarked on Non-co-operation and are determined to become self-reliant, it would be more consistent for us to dis-establish the British Committee and stop "India." It would save a needless waste of public money and turn our attention more towards ourselves.

that for several years I have held my present views about the existence of that body. It would have been irrelevant for me, perhaps, to suggest to my colleagues the extinction of that committee. It was not our function to report on the usefulness or otherwise of the Committee. We were commissioned only for preparing a new constitution. Moreover, I knew that colleagues were not averse to the existence of the British Committee. And the drawing-up of a new constitution enabled me to show that, where there was no question of principle, I was desirous of agreeing quickly with my opponents

It is not easy for me to reconcile myself to the alternative suggested by Miss Normanton *viz.*, that we should have a kind of an advisory committee or an advisor or resident in London to help the proposed British Committee with suggestions. I would far rather concentrate all our attention and all our best workers on work in India. The harvest is truly rich and the labourers are few. We can ill-spare a single worker for foreign work. It will be time for us to consider the propriety of sending a representative abroad after we have created a permanent impression in India itself by substantial and solid work.

[We are in possession of further evidence, which we have received from another esteemed correspondent in London' in connection with the very unsatisfactory condition of the newspaper "India." The total circulation of "India," our correspondent informs us, is 500 only (!) 220 in Great Britain, the rest in India. Last year's income was £ 4-17-0 (!!) only, while the expenditure for the current year is estimated—at £3300. This is how our correspondent puts it:

For the maintenance of "India" we pay—that is the poor people in India pay—£ 1800 a year out of which Mr. Syed Hussain as Editor-Secretary gets £ 550 a year with effect from October 1, Mr. Fenner Brockway as co-Editor-Secretary gets £ 550, Mr. G. P. Blizzard as Secretary £ 400, the typist £ 150, clerk £ 150.

The paper has had a chequered career but was never a success from the propagandist point of view. It has never had a constructive policy. To squander £ 1800 on a 3d. weekly with a circulation of 500, and to spend another £ 1500 on establishment charges, £ 3300 in all, looks like reckless extravagance.—Ed. Y. I.]

For furtherviews about foreign propaganda *see Supra* page 796.

in opinions. But I propose certainly to press for abolition of the committee as it is at present constituted, and the stopping of its organ *India*.

5th January, 1921

THE CONGRESS

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The largest and the most important Congress* ever held has come and gone. It was the biggest demonstration ever held against the present system of Government. The President uttered the whole truth when he said that it was a Congress in which, instead of the President and the leaders driving the people, the people drove him and the latter. It was clear to every one on the platform that the people had taken the reins in their own hands. The platform would gladly have moved at a slower pace.

The Congress gave one day to a full discussion of the creed and voted solidly for it with but two dissentients after two night's sleep over the discussion. It gave one day to a discussion of Non-co-operation resolution and voted for it with unparalleled enthusiasm. It gave the last day to listening to the whole of the remaining thirty-two Articles of the Constitution† which were read and translated word for word by Maulana Mahomed Ali in a loud and clear voice. It showed that it was intelligently following the reading of it, for there was dissent when Article Eight was reached. It referred to non-interference by the Congress in the internal affairs of

* The session of the Congress held at Nagpur in December, 1920.

† *See* Appendix.

the Native states.* The Congress would not have passed the proviso if it had meant that it could not even voice the feelings of the people residing in the territories ruled by the princes. Happily a resolution suggesting the advisability of establishing Responsible Government in their territories enabled me to illustrate to the audience that the proviso did not preclude the

* The following appeared in *Young India* of 17th November, 1921: *Feudatory States*—The All-India Congress Committee having defined the Congress policy regarding foreign states, the demand was naturally made to define its policy towards our own states. The broad outlines of Congress policy were formulated by the Congress at the Nagpur session, namely of non-intervention in the internal affairs of these states. The states themselves could not wish for anything better or more unequivocal. And the All-India Congress Committee can only define the policy within the four corners of that resolution. Strictly in accord with that resolution, Congress workers have refrained from taking the message of Non-co-operation to the states, except its permanent, purifying or economic parts which would hold good even without Non-co-operation. These are the drink evil, Swadeshi, Hindu Muslim unity, non-violence and untouchability. The Congress can have nothing but good-will towards these states, so long as their subjects are well treated. And even when they are ill-treated, the Congress cannot and will not exercise any pressure or force save that of public opinion. And therefore nationalist organs do not hesitate to discuss, when necessary, 'in strong language the grievances of the subjects in some of these states. The thoughtless and wanton ill-treatment, for instance, of Seth Jamanlalji and his party in the confines of Bikaner state whilst they were prosecuting merely their campaign of Swadeshi has justly evoked hostile criticism. The liberal states may therefore look for every encouragement from the Congress, and the reactionary ones at the most fierce criticism of their methods and measures. Moreover, the Congress cannot but sympathise with the states in their humiliating plight. The imperial power has used them as pawns in its game of exploitation. They are least able to resist the illegitimate and insidious pressure that is brought to bear upon them from time to time. They must therefore realise that the increase of people's power means decrease of the humiliating influence described by me.

Congress from ventilating the grievances and aspirations of the subjects of these states, whilst it clearly prevented the Congress from taking any executive action in connection with them; as for instance holding a hostile demonstration in the Native States against any action of theirs. The Congress claims to dictate to the Government but it cannot do so by the very nature of its constitution in respect of the Native States.

Thus the Congress has taken three important steps after the greatest deliberation. It has expressed its determination in the clearest possible terms to attain complete self-government, if possible still in association with the British people, but even without, if necessary. It proposes to do so only by means that are honourable and non-violent. It has introduced fundamental changes in the constitution regulating its activities and has performed an act of self-denial in voluntarily restricting the number of delegates to one for every fifty thousand of the population of India and has insisted upon the delegates being the real representatives of those who want to take any part in the political life of the country. And with a view to ensuring the representation of all political parties, it has accepted the principle of "single transferable vote." It has reaffirmed the Non-co-operation resolution of the special session and amplified it in every respect. It has emphasised the necessity of non-violence and laid down that the attainment of *Swaraj* is conditional upon the complete harmony between the component parts of India, and has therefore inculcated Hindu-Muslim unity. The Hindu delegates have called upon their leaders to settle disputes between Brahmins and non-Brahmins and have urged upon the religious heads the neccessity of getting rid of the poison of untouchability. The Congress has

told the parents of school-going children, and the lawyers that they have not responded sufficiently to the call of nation and that they must make greater effort in doing so. It therefore follows that the lawyers who do not respond quickly to the call for suspension and the parents who persist in keeping their children in Government and aided institutions must find themselves dropping out from the public life, of the country. The country calls upon every man and woman in India to do their full share. But of the details of the Non-co-operation resolution, I must write later.

30th March, 1921

THE CONGRESS CONSTITUTION

(By M. K. Gandhi)

The last Congress * has given a constitution whose working is in itself calculated to lead to Swaraj. It is intended to secure in every part of India representative committee working in conjunction with, and under willing and voluntary submission to, a central organisation—The All-India Congress Committee. It establishes an adult suffrage open to men and women, subject only to two qualifications, signing of the creed and a nominal payment of four annas. It is intended to secure due representation of all parties and communities. If, then, it is honestly worked, and commands confidence and respect, it can oust the present Government without the slightest difficulty. For, the latter has no power except through the co-operation, willing or forced, of the people. The force it exercises is almost through our own people. One lac of Europeans, without our help, can only hold

* Nagpur Congress held in December, 1920.

less than one-seventh of our villages each, and it would be difficult, for one man, even when physically present, to impose his will on, say, four hundred men and women—the average population of an Indian village.

The problem before us, therefore, is one of opposing our will to that of the will of the Government, in other words, to withdraw our co-operation from it. If we are united in purpose, the Government must obey our will or retire. It is the disturbing factors of which the Government avails itself for the consolidation of its power. When we are violent, it resorts to terrorism; when we are disunited, it resorts to bribery; when we are united, it resorts to cajolery and conciliation; when we are clamant, it puts temptations in the way of those who cry out most. All, therefore, we need do is to remain non-violent, united, and unresponsive to bribery and cajolery.

Surely, there is not much education required to accomplish this much among a people who are cultured and intelligent. It is not difficult to present to them a common purpose and a common platform which they can appreciate and understand. But this means not talking, but acting and organising. I suggest that we concentrate on registering before the 30th June, in an accurate manner, at least one crore of members in the Congress organisation. No registration is to be deemed complete without the payment of four annas and the acceptance of the creed. We must aim at enlisting every adult member of every family. It should be our boast to have as many women as men on our registers. We should have all the Mussalmans, all the castes, all the artisans, and all the pariahs, whom we can induce to come to our register. It will then become a most democratic register of voters that the world can show.

If the suggestions made by me are acceptable, we have to concentrate our attention upto the 30th June on getting:

(1) One crore Rupees for the Tilak Swaraj Fund,
(2) One crore members on the Congress register,
(3) The spinning wheel introduced in twenty lacs of homes.

In order to register one crore members, I estimate that we shall have canvassed at least twenty lacs of homes, counting five member to a family. Workers can certainly persuade Congress families to take up one wheel per family. Twenty-five lacs of spinning wheels in twenty-one provinces, is not an ambitious scheme.

Let us not waste our resources in thinking of too many national problems and their solutions. A patient, who tries many nostrums at a time, dies. A physician, who experiments on his patient with a combination of remedies, loses his reputation and passes for a quack. Chastity in work is as essential as chastity in life. All dissipation is bad. We have hitherto all pulled our own way, and thus wasted away national strength in a most extravagant manner. To boycott foreign cloth within the year is a practical feasibility. To bring into being a working organisation for the Congress is an easy thing for honest workers. The collection of one crore of rupees in a methodical manner will at once create confidence and will be a tangible token of our earnestness and determination.

This programme does not mean cessation of the other activities of Non-co-operation. They go on. Drink and untouchability must vanish. The education movement is steadily going forward. The national institutions that have sprung up will, if they are efficiently managed, make headway and attract students who are still hesita-

ting. The pleaders, always a cautious and calculating class by training, will, as they see the movement progressing more and more, fall in line wlth the rest of the country. Boycott of law courts by the public is making fair progress. These things do not now require concentration of universal effort. They apply to special classes. But the three things mentioned by me are the most essential : they must be done now, and without them the movement, as a mass movement, must be pronounced a failure.

5th January, 1921

Mr. GANDHI'S SPEECH ON THE CREED

"The object of the Indian National Congress is the attainment of Swarajya by the people of India by all legitimate and peaceful means."

There are only two kinds of objections, so far as I understand, that will be advanced from this platform. One is that we may not to-day think of dissolving the British connection. What I say is that it is derogatory to national dignity to think of permanence of British connection at any cost. We are labouring under a grievous wrong, which it is the personal duty of every Indian to get redressed. This British Government not only refuses to redress the wrong, but it refuses to acknowledge its mistake and so long as it retains its attitude, it is not possible for us to say all that we want to be or all that we want to get, retaining British connection. No matter what difficulties be in our path, we must make the clearest possible declaration to the world and to the whole of India, that we may not possibly have British connection, if the British people will not do this elementary justice. I do not, for one moment, suggest

that we want to end the British connection atall costs, unconditionally. If the British connection is for the advancement of India, we do not want to destroy it. But if it is inconsistent with our national self-respect, then it is our bounden duty to destroy it. There is room in this resolution for both—those who believe that, by retaining British connection, we can purify ourselves and purify British people, and those who have no belief. As for instance, take the extreme case of Mr. Andrews. He says all hope for India is gone for keeping the British connection.He says there must be complete severance—complete independence. There is room enough in this creed for a man like Mr. Andrews also. Take another illustration, a man like myself or my brother Shaukat Ali. There is certainly no room for us, if we have eternally to subscribe to the doctrine,whether these wrongs are redressed or not, we shall have to evolve ourselves within the British Empire: there is no room for me in that creed. Therefore, this creed is elastic enough to take in both shades of opinion and the British people will have to beware that, if they do not want to do justice, it will be the bounden duty of every Indian to destroy the Empire.

I want just now to wind up my remarks with a personal appeal, drawing your attention to an object lesson that was presented in the Bengal camp yesterday. If you want Swaraj, you have got a demonstration of how to get Swaraj. There was a little bit of skirmish, a little bit of squabble, and a little bit of difference in the Bengal camp, as there will always be differences so long as the world lasts. I have known differences between husband and wife, because I am still a husband; I have noticed differences between parents and children, because I am still a father of four boys, and they are all strong enough to destroy their father so far as bodily

struggle is concerned; I possess that varied experience of husband and parent; I know that we shall always have squabbles, we shall always have differences, but the lesson that I want to draw your attention to is that I had the honour and privilege of addressing both the parties. They gave me their undivided attention and what is more, they showed their attachment, their affection and their fellowship for me by accepting the humble advice that I had the honour of tendering to them, and I told them I am not here to distribute justice that can be awarded only through our worthy president. But I ask you not to go to the president, you need not worry him. If you are strong, if you are brave, if you are intent upon getting Swaraj, and if you really want to revise the creed, then you will bottle up your rage, you will bottle up all the feelings of injustice that may rankle in your hearts and forget these things here under this very roof, and I told them to forget their differences, to forget the wrongs. I don't want to tell you or go into the history of that incident. Probably most of you know. I simply want to invite your attention to the fast.* I don't say they have settled up their differences. I hope they have, but I do know that they undertook to forget the differences. They undertook not to worry the President, they undertook not to make any demonstration here or in the Subjects Committee. All honour to those who listened to that advice.

I only wanted my Bengali friends and all the other friends who have come to this great assembly with a fixed determination to seek nothing but the settlement of their country, to seek nothing but the advancement of their respective rights, to seek nothing but the conservation of the national honour. I appeal to every one

*See *infra.*

of you to copy the example set by those who felt aggrieved and who felt that their heads were broken. I know, before we have done with this great battle on which we have embarked at the special sessions of the Congress, we have to go probably, possibly through a sea of blood, but let it not be said of us or any one of us that we are guilty of shedding blood, but let it be said by generations yet to be born that we suffered, that we shed not somebody's blood but our own, and so I have no hesitation in saying that I do not want to show much sympathy for those who had their heads broken or who were said to be even in danger of losing their lives. What does it matter? It is much better to die at the hands, at least, of our own countrymen. What is there to revenge ourselves about or upon? So I ask everyone of you that, if at any time there is blood-boiling within you against some fellow countrymen of yours, even though he may be in the employ of Government, even though he may be in the Secret Service, you will take care not to be offended and not to return blow for blow. Understand that the very moment you return the blow from the detective, your cause is lost. This is your non-violent campaign. And so I ask everyone of you not to retaliate but to bottle up all your rage, to dismiss your rage from you and you will rise graver men. I am here to congraluate those who have restrained themselves from going to the President and bringing the dispute before him.

Therefore, I appeal to those who feel aggrieved to feel that they have done the right thing in forgetting it and if they have not forgotten, I ask them to try to forget the thing; and that is the object lesson to which I wanted to draw your attention if you want to carry this resolution. Do not carry this resolution only by accla-

mation for this resolution, but I want you to accompany the carrying out of this resolution with a faith and resolve which nothing on earth can move. That you are intent upon getting Swaraj at the earliest possible moment and that you are intent upon getting Swaraj by means that are legitimate, that are honourable and by means that are non-violent, that are peaceful, you have resolved upon, so far you can say to-day. We cannot give battle to this Government by means of steel, but we can give battle by exercising, what I have so often called, "soul force," and soul force is not the prerogative of one man, of a Sanyasi or even a so called saint. Soul force is the prerogative of every human being, female or male, and therefore I ask my countrymen, if they want to accept this resolution, to accept it with that firm determination and to understand that it is inaugurated under such good and favourable auspices as I have described to you.

In my humble opinion, the Congress will have done the rightiest thing, if it unanimously adopts this resolution. . . . May God grant that you will pass this resolution unanimously, may God grant that you will also have the courage and the ability to carry out the resolution and that within one year.

29th June, 1921

THE WORKING COMMITTEE AND ITS FUNCTION

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The resolutions of the Working Committee have come in for some hostile criticism. Its ruling questioning the propriety of Non-co-operating lawyers attending law-courts and Non-co-operating defendants entering upon

their defence in law-courts, has been seriously called in question, and it has even been suggested, that its rulings may be disregarded. It is, therefore, necessary to examine the function of the Working Committee. And before we can understand this, we must understand the Congress Constitution.

The goal of the Congress is attainment of Swaraj by peaceful and legitimate means. The Congress must be worked, so as to hasten India's progress towards her destined goal. The Constitution is so devised as to tax and prove the nation's capacity for self-government. It undoubtedly sets up a system of voluntary government, in which the only force available is public opinion and the good-will of the people. And seeing that the Congress is to-day engaged in opposing, and if need be, destroying the existing system, it follows that the greater the authority of the Congress, the less must be that of the Government. When the Congress commands complete confidence and *willing obedience* to its instructions, there is full Swaraj. For, then the Government must respect popular opinion expressed through the Congress, or it must commit suicide. The Congress must, therefore, become the most united, the strongest in character and the largest organisation in the land. The Congress policy, therefore, must command the readiest acceptance.

The Congress meets in session only once a year. It lays down policies. The All-India Congress Committee is designed to carry out the Congress policy as embodied in its resolutions. It must interpret all resolutions, and attend to all new matters, with the same authority as the Congress. The members may debate upon different propositions and interpretations as much as they choose, but except on matters of vital principle, the dissenters must

conform to, and faithfully carry out, the resolutions of the majority. The discussions in the Committee are not open for rediscussion in public. In order to make the All-India Congress Committee an efficient body, the Constitution has provided for a Working Committee of fifteen, which must meet often and must be able to deal with all the matters delegated to it by the All-India Congress Committee. It is designed to exercise all the functions of the All-India Congress Committee, when the latter is not sitting. It must watch and guide public opinion, it must interpret it, it must keep all the subsidiary organisations in working order, it must attend to all-India finance, it must distribute it, and whenever decision on matters of grave importance has to be taken, it must summon a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee for direction. The Working Committee is to the Congress, what a Cabinet is to a Parliament. Its decisions must command respect, if we are to evolve constitutional government during this year. Naturally, therefore, its members must be those, who command the greatest respect of the All-India Congress Committee and of the nation. It dare not take any hasty decisions, and it must be a homogenous body. It cannot have two policies or two parties within itself. Whilst the Congress represents the whole nation, and may therefore have every type and all parties, the Working Committee must consist of men representing the policy and the party, that have the confidence of the majority of the delegates. Its decisions have largely to be unanimous. When a member cannot pull on with the rest, he can resign, but he may not obstruct or affect the deliberations of the Committee by an open discussion of its deliberations in the press. Whilst, therefore, the decisions of the Working Committee should be carried out

by Congressmen, it is not an irresponsible body. It can be dismissed by the All-India Congress Committee by a vote of no confidence. Its decisions are subject to be reviewed by the All-India Congress Committee, and even set aside for grave reasons. In my humble opinion, unless the Working Committee carries weight with people, it is hardly possible to attain Swaraj during this year. Every one of us must, therefore, work to make the Congress an irresistible body by its resolutions being carried out in every little detail. What the Government does in the last resort by force of arms, the Congress expects to do by force of affection. The Government has rendered itself irresistible by striking terror in the hearts of the people, the Congress must make itself felt by securing the free-will acceptance of its doctrines and policies. Non-violence, thus, runs through everything connected with the people's programme. But each organisation expects to succeed by reason of people's co-operation. Loyalty to the Congress decisions is a *sine qua non* of success of the Nagpur determination to achieve Swaraj during the year.

10th November, 1921

THE ALL-INDIA CONGRESS COMMITTEE

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The present All-India Congress Committee met for the last time at Delhi on the 4th November. The arrangements were under the control of the renowned Hakimji Ajmal Khan. He is ailing and badly needs rest. But he will not have any. His spacious house and Dr. Ansari's have been turned into *Dharmashalas* for the accommodation

of guests, whether Hindu or Mahomedan. The Hindus have their prejudices scrupulously respected. Those who will not take even water at a Muslim house are provided separate quarters. Here in Delhi one certainly finds Hindu-Moselm unity in full working order. The Hindus implicitly and gratefully accept Hakimji's leadership and they do not hesitate to place their religious interests too in his keeping.

The All-India Congress Committee is the People's Parliament elected annually. It has year by year grown in importance and representative character. And to-day it is undoubtedly the mouthpiece of all those adult men and women belonging to any religion or party who can afford to pay four annas, who accept the simple creed of the Congress and who have cared to have their names entered in the Congress register. As a matter of fact, the delegates include Hindus, Mussalmans, Sikhs, Christians almost, perhaps, in their numerical proportion. I do not know whether it has Parsis and Jews. It has a very fair proportion of women delegates. It has also *Panchama* delegates. If any interest is under-represented, the fault lies with that interest. The delegates are all unpaid and attend at their own expense and pay for their own board and lodging. If the healthy practice on the part of the inviting cities of entertaining the delegates as guests has sprung up, it is a sign of the liberality of the citizens, no part of their statutory obligation. The majority of these elected representatives travel third class and are satisfied with mere elementary comforts. The house of this People's Parliament consisted of a temporary canvass pandal with a few shrubs to decorate it. Chairs and tables were provided, I presume, because it would have been difficult to ensure sufficient cleanliness and freedom from dust in the compound where

the pandal was erected. Yellow-coloured *Khadi* cloth served as table-cloth for the President's table. The members, both men and women, were dressed mostly in coarse *Khadi,* a few only had what is now known as the Bezwada fineness. The dresses were simple and of Indian style. I have gone into these details, because the All-India Congress Committee to many of us is a model for the future Parliament under Swaraj. It is in keeping with the real state of India. It is somewhat a reflection of the poverty of the country, its simplicity and of its climatic requirements.

Contrast this with the false show, the pomp and the extravagance at Simla and at the new Delhi!

As the outer, so the inner. The most important business of the nation was finished in a most businesslike manner inside of twelve hours. Nothing was done or allowed without the closest scrutiny. The resolution on the dispute between the President and the Working Committee was discussed in the calmest manner possible. Jealous of its own rights, the Committee ratified the decision of the Working Committee that the right of interpretation of substantive law belonged to it rather than the President. It would not however allow anything to appear in the resolution which could by any stretch of imagination be considered discourteous to the President.

The resolution of the session was, however, the one on Civil Disobedience which I give below:

"Whereas there is not much over one month for the fulfilment of the national determination to establish Swaraj before the end of the year, and whereas the nation has demonstrated its capacity for exemplary self-restraint by observing perfect non-violence over the arrest and imprisonment of the Ali Brothers and the

other leaders, and whereas it is desirable for the nation to demonstrate its capacity for further suffering and discipline, discipline sufficient for the attainment of Swaraj, the All-India Congress Committee authorises every province, on its own responsibility, to undertake Civil Disobedience including non-payment of taxes, in the manner that may be considered the most suitable by the respective Provincial Congress Committees subject to the following conditions:

1. In the event of individual Civil Disobedience, the individual must know hand spinning, and must have completely fulfilled that part of the programme which is applicable to him or her, *e.g.*, he or she must have entirely discarded the use of foreign cloth and adopted only handspun and hand-woven garments, must be a believer in Hindu-Muslim unity and in the unity amongst all the communities professing different religions in India as an article of faith, must believe in non-violence as absolutely essential for the redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and the attainment of Swaraj, and if a Hindu, must, by his personal conduct, show that he regards untouchability as a blot upon nationalism.

2. In the event of mass Civil Disobedience, a District or Tahsil should be treated as a unit, and therein a vast majority of the population must have adopted full Swadeshi and must be clothed out of cloth handspun and hand woven in that District or Tahsil, and must believe in and practise all the other items of Non-co-operation.

Provided that no civil resister should expect to be supported out of public funds, and members of the families of civil resisters undergoing sentence will be expected to support themselves by carding, hand-spinning, and hand-weaving or any other means.

Provided further that upon application by any Provincial Congress Committee, it is open to the Working Committee to relax the conditions of Civil Disobedience, if it is satisfied that any conditions should be waived."

Those who were eager to start Civil Disobedience immediately brought forward a series of amendments which they supported with considerable skill, and yet the speeches were models of brevity. Every one of the amendments was rejected after the fullest discussion. The chief debater was Maulana Hasrat Mohani, who being impatient for Civil Disobedience could not understand the imposition of the tests laid down for would-be civil resisters. One and only one addition was accepted at the instance of the Sikh delegates. They are most sensitive about their special rights. If, therefore, Hindu-Moslem unity was maintained, Hindu-Moslem-Sikh unity in the Punjab must also be insisted upon. 'Then why not mention the others?' was the burden of other speeches. The result was, that 'unity among all the communities professing other religions' was added. It is a wise addition, for it shows that Hindu-Moslem unity is not a menace but it is a symbol of unity among all.

Whilst, therefore, there is perfect unanimity in the Committee, it would be wrong to suppose that there is no obstruction or opposition in the Committee. The Maharashtra party is a capable and drilled body. It has adopted the programme more from loyalty to the Congress and the rule of majority than from deep conviction.* It is giving a trial to a programme in which it has not implicit faith. It makes its presence felt by mild obstruction. But it is too patriotic to carry obstruction to the point of destruction. Mr. Abhyankar fortifies it by his sledge-hammer oratory. Mr. Aney

*See *infra.*

supports it by his calm logic. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta is the freelance of the party. He effectively uses the Committee for developing his debating skill and obstructive tactics. The Committee refuses to treat him seriously, and he lets you know that he does not expect to be treated seriously. The house laughs at his expense and he heartily joins in it. He enlivened the proceedings at the outset by proposing himself to the chair if no other member would allow himself to be proposed in the place of a member of the Working Committee. He considers the members of the Working Committee to be all honourable men, and the measure of the honour is, that they are constantly in his opinion arrogating to themselves rights they do not possess. The reader, however, must not think that all this is done with any poison in the performance. I have not known a better-behaved or more good-humoured assembly. And I regard the Maharashtra party to be an acquisition of which any nation would feel proud. Indeed, I refer to the party to emphasise my contention that the Committee is composed of men who know their minds and who are determined to give a good account of themselves in their effort to win India's freedom.

4th August, 1920

THE CONGRESS AND NON-CO-OPERATION

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The Hon'ble Pundit Malaviyaji, for whom I entertain the highest regard and whom I have so often described as *Dharmatma*, has appealed to me both publicly and privately to suspend Non-co-operation till the Congress has pronounced upon it. The *Mahratta* has also done

likewise. These appeals have made me pause and think, but I regret to say that I have not been able to respond to them. I would do much and give much to please Punditji. I am anxious to receive his approbation and blessing for all my actions. But a higher duty requires me not to turn from the course mapped out by the Non-co-operation Committee. There are moments in your life when you must act, even though you cannot carry your best friends with you. The still small voice within you must always be the final arbiter when there is a conflict of duty.

The reason for asking me to suspend action is that the Congress will presently meet and consider the whole question of Non-co-operation and give its verdict. It would therefore be better, says Punditji, to await the Congress decision. In my humble opinion, it is no Congressman's duty to consult the Congress before taking an action in a matter in which he has no doubts. To do otherwise may mean stagnation.

The Congress is after all the mouth-piece of the nation. And when one has a policy or a programme which one would like to see adopted, but on which one wants to cultivate public opinion, one naturally asks the Congress to discuss it and form an opinion. But when one has an unshakable faith in a particular policy or action, it would be folly to wait for the Congress pronouncement. On the contrary, one must act and demonstrate its efficacy so as to command acceptance by the nation.

My loyalty to the Congress requires me to carry out its policy when it is not contrary to my conscience. If I am in a minority, I may not pursue my policy in the name of the Congress. The decision of the Congress on any given question therefore does not mean that it

prevents a Congressman from any action to the contrary, but if he acts, he does so at his own risk and with the knowledge that the Congress is not with him.

Every Congressman, every public body has the right, it is sometimes their duty, to express their own opinion, act upon it even and thus anticipate the verdict of the Congress. Indeed it is the best way of serving the nation. By initiating well-thought-out policies, we furnish data for a great deliberative body like the Congress to enable it to form a well-informed opinion. The Congress cannot express national opinion with any definiteness, unless at least some of us have already firm views about a particular course of conduct. If all suspended their opinion, the Congress must necessarily suspend its own.

There are always three classes of people in an institution. Those who have favourable views on a given policy, those who have fixed but unfavourable views on it and those who hold no fixed views. The Congress decides for this third and large group. I hold fixed views on Non-co-operation. I believe that, if we are to make anything of the reforms, we will have to create a pure, clean and elevating atmosphere instead of the present fœtid, unclean and debasing atmosphere to work them in. I believe that our first duty is to compel justice from the Imperial Government in regard to the Khilafat and the Punjab. In both these matters, injustice is being sustained by untruth and insolence. I therefore consider it to be the duty of the nation to purge the Government of the uncleanness before they can co-operate with each other. Even opposition or obstruction is possible where there is mutual respect and confidence. At the present moment, the governing authority has no respect for us or our feelings. We have

no faith in it. In these circumstances, co-operation is a crime. Holding these strong views, I can serve the Congress and the country only by reducing them to practice and thus affording to the Congress material for forming an opinion.

For me to suspend Non-co-operation would be to prove untrue to the Mussalman brethren. They have their own religious duty to perform. Their religious sentiment has been deeply hurt by a total disregard of laws of justice and their own promises by British ministers. The Mussalmans must take action now. They cannot await the Congress decision. They can only expect the Congress to ratify their action and share their sorrows and their burdens. Their action cannot be delayed till the Congress has decided on a policy nor can their course be altered by an adverse decision of the Congress unless their action is otherwise found to be an error. The Khilafat is a matter of conscience with them. And in matters of conscience, the Law of Majority has no place.

8th December, 1921

WHAT TO DO?

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Mr. Jayakar's address has been followed by a conference of all Maharashtra at Akola. Mr. Jayakar is a thinker, he loves his country. He commands and deserves respectful attention. Those who gathered together at Akola are earnest patriotic seasoned soldiers. They are amongst the boldest and the most disciplined workers in the land. And one has to pause and think when they dissent from a programme.

Mr. Jayakar's address and the proceedings of the Akola conference have made me think furiously. There is no difficulty about understanding and appreciating the suggested modifications. It is a programme, if I may venture to say so, of unbelief. It is based upon the assumption that Swaraj is not attainable within a short time and that we must make such use as we can of the existing machinery with a view to improving it. The programme now being worked is based upon the belief that the existing machinery is worthless and its use only retards our progress and distracts attention.

The corner-stone of the national movement is Non-co-operation with violence whether of the pen or the sword. Education and legislation are the instruments to-day in the hands of the violent. To make use of their law courts or their legislatures or their schools is to take part in their violence. There is a fundamental distinction between the two processes. The one is a septic and the other antiseptic. They are diametrically opposite. In the one you rely upon the inherent purity of the system to destroy all poisonous germs that have entered the body, and in the other you resort to outside applications, stronger poisons to destroy the intruding germs. Both may be effective, but they cannot be used at the same time. We definitely rejected the antiseptic treatment last year. The majority at Maharashtra frankly suggest a return.

We are no longer in the dark. We have the results of fifteen months' working of the new method. Rejection of courts, schools and councils is an integral part of the programme. We may not give up parts because we have not achieved full success, if we are convinced that in themselves they are desirable. Although we have not succeeded in emptying the three institutions, we

have demolished their prestige. They neither worry nor dazzle us. That many parents, many lawyers and many law-givers have not responded, shows that we must make a greater attempt to wean them, not now by arguing but by the exemplary conduct of abstainers. For me they are the Government. Just as I may not apply for a paid post because no Government servant resigns, I may not join the ranks of voluntary servants because the latter do not come away. I am convinced that the country has risen because of the abstention even of the few from association with these emblems of the existing Government.

Inadequate response is an eloquent plea if you will for establishing better schools and panchayats, not for confession of incapacity by returning to the fleshpots of Egypt.

But we have passed the stage of argument. When the sun is shining, you do not need to demonstrate its heat giving power by argument. And if anybody shivers in spite of being in the sun, no amount of argument can convince him of the sun's warmth, nor may you quarrel with the shivering one. He must seek other means, if there be any, of warming himself. My plea is for everyone to act according to his belief. The Congress provides the widest platform. Its creed is incredibly simple. A full-fledged co-operator as well as a nationalist who wants a change in the programme can work in it. Let us not push the mandate theory to ridiculous extremes and become slaves to resolutions of majorities. That would be a revival of brute force in a more virulent form. If rights of minorities are to be respected, the majority must tolerate and respect their opinion and action. There is no reason whatsoever why nationalists may not practise as lawyers or send their

children to Government schools or seek election to the councils and still belong to the Congress. Only they may not act in the name of the Congress so long as they have not brought round to their view the majority of Congressmen. It will be the duty of the majority to see to it that minorities receive a proper hearing and are not otherwise exposed to insults. Swaraj will be an absurdity if individuals have to surrender their judgment to majority.

I wish to make a personal appeal to all Congressmen. I would ask them to believe me when I say that as leader and originator of the movement inaugurated at Calcutta, I would feel hampered if I have not the hearty co-operation of those who vote for the programme. I would gladly find myself in a minority and confidently expect to march to victory. This Government cannot stand for one day the determined religious opposition of one district, if only the others will not interfere in the manner Bombay did.

There is room enough in our great country for as many parties as there are honest men. I would welcome an efficient and able organisation containing men, who believe in using Government institutions, and finding what warmth they can give them, even as I would have all organisations to extend toleration to those whole-hoggers who wish to cut of all possible connection with the Government. There is no reason why a province which can carry the people with it should not organise itself even on either basis.

I plead, that is to say, for a truthful programme and truthful parties. Let people only work programmes in which they believe implicitly. Loyalty to human institutions has its well defined limits. To be loyal to an organisation must not mean subordination of one's settled

convictions. Parties may fall and parties may rise, but if we are to attain freedom, our deep convictions must remain unaffected by such passing changes.

We are on the eve of a new life. We may not see the image of Swaraj risen before us at the end of the month, but we must feel the warm glow of the coming event in no unmistakable fashion. And we shall feel it only if every one of us will try to be true to himself. To believe in the infallibility of our means is to attain Swaraj. The vote of the Congress this year must not be a leap in the dark. It must not be any more in the nature of an experiment. It should be an emphatic endorsement or rejection of the existing programme.

2nd March, 1922

CONGRESS A FETISH

We must avoid the Congress becoming a fetish. I love the idea of everybody becoming a Congressmen and everybody yielding willing and intelligent obedience to the Congress resolutions. But I abhor the idea of anybody becoming a Congressman merely because it is an old or a great institution or yielding obedience to its resolutions whether one likes it or no. The rule of majority has a narrow application, *i.e.*, one should yield to the majority in matters of detail. But it is slavery to be amenable to the majority no matter what its decisions are. Thus notwithstanding Congress resolution, it is wrong, in my opinion, to withdraw from councils or not to covet election thereto, if one believes that councils are even a tolerably good institution. It is similarly wrong for a lawyer to suspend practice merely because the Congress says so. Democracy is not a state

in which people act like sheep. Under democracy, individual liberty of opinion and action is jealously guarded. I, therefore, believe that the minority has a perfect right to act differently from the majority so long as it does not act in the name of the Congress. A practising lawyer may become a Congressman, he cannot be called a Non-co-operator. He cannot and should not, therefore, be on the All-India Congress Committee. Similarly one who does not wear hand-spun and hand-woven *Khaddar* or a title-holder or a councillor may not be called "Non-co-operators" though all those may be Congressmen. . . .

But not only do I think that a Congressman is not bound by the resolutions which he does not approve of, he is also entitled always to go beyond the Congress resolutions, provided that he does not violate the creed and if he does not act in the name of the Congress. Supposing that the restrictions put by the Congress do not suit a particular province, that that province has even voted against them, that that province finds that it can look after itself, it has every right to go forward and justify its rebellion by success. The Congress only finds the highest common factor, but it may conceivably be far short of the requirements of a particular province. That province may, if it has confidence and if it is not likely to jeopardise any Congress interest, certainly go on with its own programme on its own responsibility and at the risk of a vote of censure from the Congress. This, in my opinion, is what the spirit of democracy requires. What I have stated is an illustration of domestic Civil Disobedience. Thus and thus only shall we save ourselves from false idolatry.

26th January, 1921

'HIND SWARAJ' OR THE INDIAN HOME-RULE

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

It is certainly my good fortune that this booklet of mine is receiving wide attention. The original is in Gujarati. It had a chequered career. It was first published in the columns of the 'Indian Opinion' of South Africa. It was written in 1908 during my return voyage from London to South Africa in answer to the Indian school of violence, and its prototype in South Africa. I came in contact with every known Indian anarchist in London. Their bravery impressed me, but I feel that their zeal was misguided. I felt that violence was no remedy for India's ills, and that her civilization required the use of a different and higher weapon for self-protection. The *Satyagraha* of South Africa was still an infant hardly two years old. But it had developed sufficiently to permit me to write of it with some degree of confidence. It was so much appreciated that it was published as a booklet. It attracted some attention in India. The Bombay Government prohibited its circulation. I replied by publishing its translation. I thought that it was due to my English friends that they should know its contents. In my opinion, it is a book which can be put into the hands of a child. It teaches the gospel of love in the place of that of hate. It replaces violence with self-sacrifice. It pits soul-force against brute force. It has gone through several editions and I commend it to those who would care to read it. I withdraw nothing except one word of it, and that in deference to a lady friend. I have given the reason for the alteration in the preface to the Indian edition.

The booklet is a severe condemnation of 'modern

civilization.' It was written in 1908. My conviction is deeper to-day than ever. I feel that, if India would discard 'modern civilization,' she can only gain by doing so.

But I would warn the reader against thinking that I am to-day aiming at the Swaraj described therein. I know that India is not ripe for it. It may seem an impertinence to say so. But such is my conviction. I am individually working for the self-rule pictured therein. But to-day my corporate activity is undoubtedly devoted to the attainment of Parliamentary Swaraj* in

* The following notes appeared in *Young India* in regard to this term:

What is Swaraj?—"The Times of India" questions whether I have any clear notion of Swaraj. If the writer will go through the back numbers of *Young India*, he will find a complete answer to the question. But I may mention here briefly that the least that Swaraj means is a settlement with the Government in accordance with the wishes of the chosen representatives of the people. Therefore the Congress representatives, if they can make good their claim by providing an inexhaustible supply of prisoners, will have a determining voice in any settlement that may be made. Swaraj therefore means the capacity of the people of India to enforce their demands. I totally dissent from the Viceroy's view that Swaraj must come from the British Parliament unless it comes through the sword. The British Parliament will only ratify the people's wish when the 'sword' had made it irresistible. Non-co-operators are trying to use the sword of self-sacrifice in preference to that of steel. India's soul is pitted against British steel. We shall not have to wait long to know what popular Swaraj is.—15th December, 1921.

The Meaning of Swaraj.—A friend from South Africa writes to say that several Europeans there are prepared to help the struggle for Swaraj, but they want to be assured on certain points. As the points raised are of general importance, I gladly deal with them here.

(1) Does Mr. Gandhi's Swaraj mean sovereign independence, or full responsible Government within the Empire on the Dominion lines?

I should certainly be satisfied with full responsible Government on

accordance with the wishes of the people of India. I am not aiming at destroying railways or hospitals, though I would certainly welcome their natural destruction. Neither railways nor hospitals are a test of a high and pure civilization. At best they are a necessary evil. Neither adds one inch to the moral stature of a nation. Nor am I aiming at a permanent destruction of law courts, much as I regard it as a 'consummation devoutly to be wished for.' Still less am I trying to destroy all machinery and mills. It requires a higher simplicity and renunciation than the people are to-day prepared for.

The only part of the programme which is now being carried out in its entirety is that of Non-violence. But I regret to have to confess that even that is not being carried out in the spirit of the book. If it were, India would establish Swaraj in a day. If India adopted the

---

Dominion lines, if the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs are redressed. India cannot remain within the Empire, if the latter cannot redress the two wrongs, for full responsible Government will have no meaning for India, if she cannot refuse to give pensions to officers who have wronged her, or if she cannot secure a settlement of the Khilafat terms. England then becomes an 'enemy country' for India.

(2) Do the Muslims claim Palestine, or will they restore it to the Jews who are the original owners?

The Muslims claim Palestine as an integral part of Jaziratul-Arab. They are bound to retain its custody, as an injunction of the Prophet. But that does not mean that the Jews and the Christians cannot freely go to Palestine, or even reside there and own property. What non-Muslims cannot do is to acquire sovereign jurisdiction. The Jews cannot receive sovereign rights in a place which has been held for centuries by Muslim powers by right of religious conquest. The Muslim soldiers did not shed their blood in the late war for the purpose of surrendering Palestine out of Muslim control. I would like my Jewish friends to impartially consider the position of the seventy million Muslims of India. As a free nation, can they tolerate what they must regard as a treacherous disposal of their sacred possession?

6th April, 1921.

doctrine of love as an active part of her religion and introduced it in her politics, Swaraj would descend upon India from heaven. But I am painfully aware that that event is far off as yet.

I offer these comments, because I observe that much is being quoted from the booklet to discredit the present movement. I have even seen writings suggesting that I am playing a deep game, that I am using the present turmoil to foist my fads on India, and am making religious experiments at India's expense. I can only answer that *Satyagraha* is made of sterner stuff. There is nothing reserved and nothing secret in it. A portion of the whole theory of life described in 'Hind Swaraj' is undoubtedly being carried into practice. There is no danger attendant upon the whole of it being practised. But it is not right to scare away people by reproducing from my writings passages that are irrelevant to the issue before the country.

23rd February, 1921

THE CONDITIONS OF SWARAJ

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Swaraj is easy of attainment before October next, if certain simple conditions can be fulfilled. I ventured to mention one year in September last, because I knew that conditions were incredibly simple and I felt that the atmosphere in the country was responsive. Past five months' experience has confirmed me in the opinion. I am convinced that the country has never been so ready for establishing Swaraj as now.

But it is necessary for us as accurately as possible to know the conditions. One supreme indispensable

condition is the continuance of non-violence. Rowdyism hooliganism, looting that we have recently witnessed are disturbing elements. They are danger-signals. We must be able to arrest their progress. The spirit of democracy cannot be established in a year in the midst of terrorism whether governmental or popular. In some respects, popular terrorism is more antagonistic to the growth of the democratic spirit than the governmental. For the latter strengthens the spirit of democracy, whereas the former kills it. Dyerism has evoked a yearning after freedom as nothing else has. But internal Dyerism, representing as it will terrorism by a majority, will establish an oligarchy such as stifle the spirit of all free discussion and conduct. Non-violence, therefore, as against the Government and as between ourselves, is absolutely essential to speedy success. And we must be able to devise means of observing it on our part in spite of the gravest provocations.

The next condition is our ability to bring into being the Congress organisation in terms of new constitution, which aims at establishing a Congress agency in every village with a proper electorate. It means both money and ability to give effect to Congress policies. What is really needed is not a large measure of sacrifice but ability to organise and to take simple concerted action. At the present moment we have not even succeeded in carrying the Congress message to every home in the 7½ lacs of villages of India. To do this work means at least 250 honest workers for as many districts, who have influence in their respective districts and who believe in the Congress programme. No village, no circle need wait for instructions from head quarters for founding their respective organisations.

There are certain things that are applicable to al

The most potent thing is Swadeshi. Every home must have the spinning wheel and every village can organise itself in less than a month and become self-supporting for its cloth. Just imagine what these silent revolution means and there would be no difficulty in sharing my belief that Swadeshi means *Swaraj* and *Swadharma*.

Every man and woman can give some money—be it even a pice—to the Tilak Swaraj Fund. And we need have no anxiety about financing the movement. Every man and woman can deny himself or herself all luxury, all ornamentation, all intoxicants at least for one year. And we shall have not only money but we shall have boycotted many foreign articles. Our civilization, our culture, our Swaraj depend not upon multiplying our wants—self-indulgence, but upon restricting our wants—self-denial.

We can do nothing without Hindu-Muslim unity and without killing the snake of untouchability. Untouchability is a corroding poison that is eating into the vitals of Hindu society. *Varnashram* is not a religion of superiority and inferiority. No man of God can consider another man as inferior to himself. He must consider every man as his blood-brother. It is the cardinal principle of every religion.

If this is a religious battle, no argument is necessary to convince the reader that self-denial must be its supreme test. Khilafat cannot be saved, the Punjab humanity cannot be redressed, without godliness. Godliness means change of heart—in political language, changing the angle of vision. And such a change can come in a moment. My belief is that India is ripe for that change.

Let us then rivet our attention on:

(1) Cultivating the spirit of non-violence.

(2) Setting up Congress organisations in every village.

(3) Introducing the spinning wheel in every home and manufacturing all the cloth, required for our wants, through the village weaver.

(4) Collecting as much money as possible.

(5) Promoting Hindu-muslim unity and

(6) Ridding Hinduism of the curse of untouchability and otherwise purifying ourselves by avoiding intoxicating drinks and drugs.

Have we honest, earnest, industrious, patriotic workers for this very simple programme? If we have, Swaraj will be established in India before next October.

22nd September, 1920

SWARAJ IN ONE YEAR

(By M. K. Gandhi)

Much laughter has been indulged in at my expense for having told the Congress audience at Calcutta* that if there was sufficient response to my programme of Non-co-operation Swaraj would be attained in one year. Some have ignored my condition and laughed because of the impossibility of getting Swaraj anyhow within one year.† Others have spelt the 'if' in capitals and

*Calcutta Special Congress.

†The following appeared in *Young India* of 29th December, 1920:

Swaraj in nine months.—Asked by the "Times" representative as to his impressions formed as a result of his activities during the last three months' extensive experience is that this movement of Non-co-operation has come to stay, and it is most decidedly a purifying movement, in spite of isolated instances of rowdyism, as for instance at Mrs. Besant's meeting in Bombay, at some places in Delhi, Bengal and even in Gujarat. The people are assimilating day after day the

suggested that if 'ifs' were permissible in argument, any absurdity could be proved to be a possibility. My proposition however is based on a mathematical calculation.

---

spirit of non-violence, not necessarily as a creed, but as an inevitable policy. I expect most startling results, more startling than, say, the discoveries of Sir J. C. Bose, or the acceptance by the people of non-violence. If the Government could be assured beyond any possibility of doubt that no violence would ever be offered by us, the Government would from that moment alter its character, unconsciously and involuntarily, but none the less surely on that account."

"Alter its character,—in what directions?" asked the "Times" representative.

"Certainly in the direction which we ask it should move—that being in the direction of Government becoming responsive to every call of the nation."

"Will you kindly explain further?" asked the representative.

"By that I mean," said Mr. Gandhi, "people will be able by asserting themselves through fixed determination and self-sacrifice to gain the redress of the Khilafat wrong, the Punjab wrong, and attain the Swaraj of their choice."

"But what is your Swaraj, and where does the Government come in there—the Government which you say will alter its character unconsciously?"

"My Swaraj," said Mr. Gandhi, "is the Parliamentary government of India in the modern sense of the term for the time being, and that government would be secured to us either through the friendly offices of the British people or without them."

"What do you mean by the phrase, 'without them?'" questioned the interviewer.

"This movement," continued Mr. Gandhi, "is an endeavour to purge the present Government of selfishness and greed which determine almost every one of their activities. Suppose that we have made it impossible by disassociation from them to feed their greed. They might not wish to remain in India, as happened in the case of Somaliland, where the moment its administration ceased to be a paying proposition they evacuated it."

"How do you think," asked the representative, "in practice this will work out?

"What I have sketched before you," said Mr. Gandhi, "is the final

And I venture to say that true Swaraj is a practical impossibility without due fulfilment of my conditions. Swaraj means a state such that we can maintain our separate existence without the presence of the English. If it is to be a partnership, it must be a partnership at will. There can be no Swaraj without our feeling and

---

possibility. What I expect is that nothing of that kind will happen. In so far as I understand the British people, I will recognise the force of public opinion when it has become real and patent. Then, and only then, will they realise the hideous injustice which in their name the Imperial ministers and their representatives in India have perpetrated. They will therefore remedy the two wrongs in accordance with the wishes of the people, and they will also offer a constitution exactly in accordance with the wishes of the people of India, as represented by their chosen leaders."

"Supposing that the British Government wish to retire because India is not a paying concern, what do you think will then be the position of India?"

Mr. Gandhi answered: "At that stage surely it is easy to understand that India will then have evolved either outstanding spiritual height or the ability to offer violence against violence. She will have evolved an organising ability of a high order, and will therefore be in every way able to cope with any emergency that might arise."

"In other words," observed the *Times* representative, "you expect the moment of the British evacuation, if such a contingency arises, will coincide with the moment of India's preparedness and ability and conditions favourable for India to take over the Indian administration as a going concern and work it for the benefit and advancement of the nation?"

Mr. Gandhi answered the question with an emphatic affirmative. "My experience during the last months fills me with the hope," continued Mr. Gandhi, "that within the nine months that remain of the year in which I have expected Swaraj for India we shall redress the two wrongs and we shall see Swaraj established in accordance with the wishes of the people of India."

"Where will the present Government be at the end of the nine months?" Asked the *Times* representative.

Mr. Gandhi, with a significant smile, said: "The lion will then lie with the lamb."

being the equals of Englishmen. To-day we feel that we are dependent upon them for our internal and external security, for an armed peace between the Hindus and the Mussalmans, for our education and for the supply of daily wants, nay, even for the settlement of our religious squabbles. The Rajahs are dependent upon the British for their powers and the millionaires for their millions. The British know our helplessness and Sir Thomas Holland cracks jokes quite legitimately at the expense of Non-co-operationists. To get Swaraj then is to get rid of our helplessness. The problem is no doubt stupendous even as it is for the fabled lion who having been brought up in the company of goats found it impossible to feel that he was a lion. As Tolstoy used to put it, mankind often laboured under hypnotism. Under its spell continuously we feel the feeling of helplessness. The British themselves cannot be expected to help us out of it. On the contrary, they din into our ears that we shall be fit to govern ourselves only by slow educative processes. The "Times" suggested that if we boycott the councils we shall lose the opportunity of a training in Swaraj. I have no doubt that there are many who believe what the "Times" says. It even resorts to a falsehood. It audaciously says that Lord Milner's Mission listened to the Egyptians only when they were ready to lift the boycott of the Egyptian Council. For me the only training in Swaraj we need is the ability to defend ourselves against the whole world and to live our natural life in perfect freedom even though it may be full of defects. Good government is no substitute for self-government. The Afghans have a bad Government but it is self-Government. I envy them. The Japanese learnt the art through a sea of blood. And if we to-day had the power to drive out the English by superior

brute force, we would be counted their superiors, and in spite of our inexperience in debating at the Council table or in holding executive offices, we would be held fit to govern ourselves. For brute force is the only test the west has hitherto recognised. The Germans were defeated not because they were necessarily in the wrong, but because the allied Powers were found to possess greater brute strength. In the end, therefore, India must either learn the art of war which the British will not teach her, or she must follow her own way of discipline and self-sacrifice through Non-co-operation. It is as amazing as it is humiliating that less than one hundred-thousand white men would be able to rule three hundred and fifteen million Indians. They do so somewhat undoubtedly by force but more by securing our co-operation in a thousand ways and making us more and more helpless and dependent on them as time goes forward. Let us not mistake reformed councils, more law-courts and even governorships for real freedom or power. They are but subtler methods of emasculation. The British cannot rule us by mere force. And so they resort to all means, honourable and dishonourable, in order to retain their hold on India. They want India's billions and they want India's man power for their imperialistic greed. If we refuse to supply them with men and money, we achieve our goal, namely, Swaraj, equality, manliness.

The cup of our humiliation was filled during the closing scenes in the Viceregal council. Mr. Shastri could not move his resolution on the Punjab. The Indian victims of Jalianwala received Rs. 1250, the English victims of mob-frenzy received lacs. The officials who were guilty of crimes against those whose servants they were, were reprimanded. And the councillors were satisfied. If

India were powerful, India would not have stood this addition of insult to her injury.

I do not blame the British. If we were weak in numbers as they are, we too would perhaps have resorted to the same methods as they are now employing. Terrorism and deception are weapons not of the strong but of the weak. The British are weak in numbers, we are weak in spite of our numbers. The result is that each is dragging the other down. It is common experience that Englishmen lose in character after residence in India and that Indians lose in courage and manliness by contact with Englishmen. This process of weakening is good neither for us two nations, nor for the world.

But if we Indians take care of ourselves, the English and the rest of the world would take care of themselves. Our contribution to the world's progress must therefore consist in setting our own house in order.

Training in arms for the present is out of the question. I go a step further and believe that India has a better mission for the world. It is within her power to show that she can achieve her destiny by pure self-sacrifice *i.e.*, self-purification. This can be done only by Non-co-operation. And Non-co-operation is possible only when those who commenced to co-operate begin the process of withdrawal. If we can but free ourselves from the threefold *maya* of Government-controlled schools, Government law-courts and legislative councils, and truly control our own education, regulate our disputes and be indifferent to their legislation, we are ready to govern ourselves and we are only then ready to ask the Government servants, whether civil or military, to resign, and the tax-payers to suspend payment of taxes.

And is it such an impracticable proposition to expect parents to withdraw their children from schools and

colleges and establish their own institutions or to ask lawyers to suspend their practice and devote their whole time and attention to national service against payment, where necessary, of their maintenance, or to ask candidates for councils not to enter councils and lend their passive or active assistance to the legislative machinery through which all control is exercised? The movement of Non-co-operation is nothing but an attempt to isolate the brute force of the British from all the trappings under which it is hidden and to show that brute force by itself cannot for one single moment hold India.

But I frankly confess that, until the three conditions mentioned by me are fulfilled, there is no Swaraj. We may not go on taking our college degrees, taking thousands of rupees monthly from clients for cases which can be finished in five minutes and taking the keenest delight in wasting national time on the council floor and still expect to gain national self-respect.

The last, though not the least, important part of the *Maya* still remains to be considered. That is Swadeshi. Had we not abandoned Swadeshi, we need not have been in the present fallen state. If we would get rid of the economic slavery, we must manufacture our own cloth and at the present moment only by hand-spinning and hand-weaving.

All this means discipline, self-denial, self-sacrifice, organising ability, confidence and courage. If we show this in one year among the classes that to-day count, and make public opinion, we certainly gain Swaraj within one year. If I am told that even we who lead have not these qualities in us, there certainly will never be Swaraj for India but then we shall have no right to blame the English for what they are doing. Our salvation and its time are solely dependent upon us.

13th July, 1921

AN INDIAN REPUBLIC

An esteemed correspondent writes:

"Your attention must have been drawn to statements made by Maulana Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali that, if no settlement is arrived at before Christmas regarding our campaign, an Indian republic will be declared at the Ahmedabad session of the Congress. Special importance attaches to this statement, as it is not made by any irresponsible person but by responsible leaders like the Maulanas. It is felt, however, that the statement is both unfortunate and premature, and is likely to come in the way of the programme laid down for the country by the Congress. The country as a whole has responded magnificently to the appeal of the Congress, and is prepared, excepting certain sections, to work for the attainment of Swaraj. I would ask you to give your views regarding the Maulanas' statement, and to assure the public that no departure from the policy of Non-violent Non-co-operation accepted by the Congress, will be made."

I am sorry to have to confess, that I have not seen the Maulanas' declaration, but I have no hesitation in giving the assurance, that no stone will be left unturned by me to prevent a departure even by a hair's breadth from the policy of Non-violent Non-co-operation that has been deliberately adopted by the country. Nor do I entertain the slightest fear of any departure from that policy on the part of the Brothers. I have however no difficulty about understanding the Maulanas' mind. They are quite capable of saying, that if India does not get the relief she demands in the matters of the Punjab and the Khilafat, she will at the next session of the Congress

make a declaration of independence. Swaraj within the Empire is a possibility, only if England washes her hands clean of the taint of the Khilafat breach and the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. The Congress creed has been purposely made elastic enough to admit of a demand for independence. To go no further, the Maulanas have, after all, if they have, but reiterated the opinion pronounced by Mr. Andrews, who, unlike me, considers that there is no room in the British Empire for a self-respecting and self-governing India, and who expects that some day, I shall myself be driven to that position. I am differently constituted. I never give up hope so long as there is the least chance, and I have faith enough in the British people to feel that, whilst they will test our determination and strength to the uttermost, they will not carry it to the breaking point. They are too self-conscious to part with an India awakened and strong for the sake of shielding Dyerism and O'Dwyerism and of the questionable advantage of Greek friendship. The Non-conformist conscience which is ignorantly hostile to the just aspirations of the brave Turks, will prove yielding under the Indian strain which is daily gathering force. Long before the Congress meets, if India proves true to herself, I look forward not to a Declaration of Independence, but to an honourable settlement that will satisfy the just demand of India *re* the Punjab and the Khilafat, and that will assure to her full immediate Swaraj in accordance with the wishes of her chosen representatives. Let the reader, however, not run away with the idea, that my forecast is based upon any knowledge of what is going on in Simla or Whitehall. I base it upon my profound belief in the ability of India during the next three months to assert herself, *i.e.*, in the ability of India to carry out an

almost complete boycott of foreign cloth, and by still greater self-restraint to prove her ability to adopt Civil Disobedience of a very stern character.

5th January, 1922

INDEPENDENCE

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Maulana Hasrat Mohani put up a plucky fight for Independence on the Congress platform and then as President of the Muslim League and was happily each time defeated. There is no mistake about the meaning of the Maulana. He wants to sever all connection with the British people even as partners and equals and even though the Khilafat question be satisfactorily solved. It will not do to urge that the Khilafat question can never be solved without complete independence. We are discussing merely the theory. It is common cause that if the Khilafat question cannot be solved without complete independence, *i.e.*, if the British people retain hostile attitude towards the aspirations of the Islamic world, there is nothing left for us to do but to insist upon complete independence. India cannot afford to give Britain even her moral support and must do without Britain's support moral and material, if she cannot be induced to be friendly to the Islamic world.

But assuming that Great Britain alters her attitude, as I know she will when India is strong, it will be religiously unlawful for us to insist on independence. For it will be vindictive and petulant. It would amount to a denial of God, for the refusal will then be based upon the assumption that the British people are not capable of response to the God in man. Such a position is

untenable for both a believing Mussalman and a believing Hindu.

India's greatest glory will consist not in regarding Englishmen as her implacable enemies fit only to be turned out of India at the first available opportunity but in turning them into friends and partners in a new commonwealth of nations in the place of an Empire based upon exploitation of the weaker or undeveloped nations and races of the earth and therefore finally upon force.

Let us see clearly what Swaraj together with the British connection means. It means undoubtedly India's ability to declare her independence if she wishes. Swaraj therefore will not be a free gift of the British Parliament. It will be a declaration of India's full self-expression. That it will be expressed through an Act of Parliament is true. But it will be merely a courteous ratification of the declared wish of the people of India even as it was in the case of the Union of South Africa. Not an unnecessary adverb in the Union scheme could be altered by the House of Commons. The ratification in our case will be of a treaty to which Britain will be party.

Such Swaraj may not come this year, may not come within our generation. But I have contemplated nothing less. The British Parliament, when the settlement comes, will ratify the wishes of the people of India as expressed not through the bureaucracy but through her freely chosen representatives.

Swaraj can never be a free gift by one nation to another. It is a treasure to be purchased with a nation's best blood. It will cease to be a gift when we have paid dearly for it. The Viceroy was confused when he said that Swaraj would have to come from the Parliament

unless it came by the sword. He paid no compliment to his country when he allowed his audience to infer that England was incapable of listening to the moral pressure of suffering, and he insulted the intelligence of his audience if he wished it to understand that the British Parliament would give Swaraj when it wished, irrespective of India's desires and aspirations. The fact is that Swaraj will be a fruit of incessant labour, suffering beyond measure.

But His Excellency is unused to any substitute for the sword and therefore does probably think that by exercising our debating skill in the legislative councils, some day or other we shall be able to impress the British Parliament with the desirability of granting us Swaraj. He will soon learn that there is better and more effective substitute for the sword and that is Civil Disobedience. It is daily becoming increasingly clear that Civil Disobedience will afford the course of suffering through which India must pass before she comes to her own.

We have not come to our own. There is still mutual distrust between Mussalmans and Hindus. The untouchables have not yet felt the glow of the Hindu touch. The Parsis and the Christians of India do not yet know their future under Swaraj to a certainty. We have not yet learnt the art nor realised the necessity of obeying our own laws. The spinning wheel has not yet found a permanent place in our homes. *Khadi* has not yet become the national garment. In other words, we have not yet understood the art or the conditions of self-protection.

There is still a body of opinion diminishing in volume but not yet negligible which considers that violence alone will bring Swaraj to us and that therefore violence might be permitted to continue side by side with

non-violence, *i.e.*, our non-violence should be regarded as merely a prelude to and a preparation for violence. Those who hold these views little know that their attitude constitutes a fraud upon the world. Our pledge requires that whilst we are under it we believe in the efficacy of non-violence for the quickest attainment of our goal. Each one of us is under a sacred obligation to cancel the pledge as soon as he believes that Swaraj is unattainable by non-violence or except by violence. Non-violence is a creed while it lasts. It is an expedient because it is an experiment. But whilst we are under the pledge, we are not only bound to believe in and observe non-violence but we are equally bound to persuade others to be non-violent and condemn those who do violence. I am more than ever convinced that we have not reached our goal because even we who have subscribed to the Congress creed have not all remained non-violent in word and deed nor endeavoured to be non-violent in thought or intent.

8th December, 1920

ON THE WRONG TRACK

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Lord Ronaldshay has been doing me the favour of reading my booklet on Indian Home Rule which is a translation of *Hind Swaraj*. His Lordship told his audience that if Swaraj meant what I had described it to be in the booklet, the Bengalis would have none of it. I am sorry that Swaraj of the Congress resolution does not mean the Swaraj depicted in the booklet; Swaraj according to the Congress means Swaraj that the people of India want, not what the British Government may

condescend to give. In so far as I can see, Swaraj will be a Parliament chosen by the people with the fullest power over the finance, the police, the military, the navy, the courts, and the educational institutions.*

I am free to confess that the Swaraj I expect to gain within one year, if India responds, will be such Swaraj

*In the course of a speech at Calcutta on 13th October, 1920, Mr. Gandhi had something to say on his idea of Swaraj. He said: Lord Ronaldshay who has done me the honour of reading my booklet on Home Rule has warned my countrymen against engaging themselves in a struggle for a Swaraj such as is described in that booklet. Now though I do not want to withdraw a single word of it, I would say to you on this occasion that I do not ask India to follow out to-day the methods prescribed in my booklet. If they could do that, they would have Home Rule not in a year but in a day, and India by realising that ideal wants to acquire an ascendency over the rest of the world. But it must remain a day dream more or less for the time being. What I am doing to-day is that I am giving the country a pardonable programme, not for the abolition of law courts, posts, telegraphs and of railways, but for the attainment of Parliamentary Swaraj.

He added: It was not a joke when I said on the Congress platform that Swaraj would be established in one year if there was sufficient response from the nation. . . .

I have proposed a limited programme workable within one year, having especial regard to the educated classes. We seem to be labouring under the illusion that we cannot possibly live without Councils, law courts and schools provided by the Government. The moment we are disillusioned we have Swaraj. It is demoralising both for Government and the governed that a hundred thousand pilgrims should dictate terms to a nation composed of three hundred millions. And how is it they can thus dictate terms? It is because we have been divided and they have ruled. I have never forgotten Hume's frank confession that the British Government was sustained by the policy of "Divide and Rule." Therefore it is that I have laid stress upon Hindu-Moslem Unity as one of the most important essentials for the success of Non-co-operation. But it should be no lip unity, nor *bania* unity, it should be a unity broad-based on a recognition of the heart . . . Light brings light, not darkness, and nobility done with a noble purpose will be twice rewarded.

as will make practically impossible the repetition of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs, and will enable the nation to do good or evil as it chooses, and not be 'good' at the dictation of an irresponsible, insolent, and godless bureaucracy. Under that Swaraj, the nation will have the power to impose a heavy protective tariff on such foreign goods as are capable of being manufactured in India, as also the power to refuse to send a single soldier outside India for the purpose of enslaving the surrounding or remote nationalities. The Swaraj that I dream of will be a possibility only when the nation is free to make its choice both of good and evil.

I adhere to all I have said in that booklet and I would certainly recommend it to the reader. Government over self is the truest Swaraj, it is synonymous with *moksha* or salvation, and I have seen nothing to alter the view that doctors, lawyers, and railways are no help, and are often a hindrance, to the one thing worth striving after.

* * *

But it has become the fashion nowadays to ascribe hatred to Non-co-operationism. And I regret to find that even Col. Wedgwood has fallen into the trap. I make bold to say that the only way to remove hatred is to give it disciplined vent. No man can—I cannot—perform the impossible task of removing hatred so long as contempt and despise for the feelings of India are sedulously nursed. It is a mockery to ask India not to hate when in the same breath India's most sacred feelings are contemptuously brushed aside. India feels weak and helpless and so expresses her helplessness by hating the tyrant who despises her and makes her crawl on the belly, lifts the veils of her innocent women and compels her tender children to acknowledge his power by saluting his flag four times a day. The gospel of

Non-co-operation addresses itself to the task of making the people strong and self-reliant. It is an attempt to transform hatred into pity.

A strong and self-reliant India will cease to hate Bosworth Smiths and Frank Johnsons, for she will have the power to punish them and therefore the power also to pity and forgive them. To-day she can neither punish nor forgive, and therefore helplessly nurses hatred.

16th February, 1921

WHAT WILL KILL NON-CO-OPERATION?

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Certainly violence on the part of Non-co-operators. But that is not what I wanted to answer. What can the Government do to kill Non-co-operation?—is the question I have been asked. A settlement of the Khilafat in accordance with the Muslim demand, a settlement of the Punjab in accordance with the Indian demand, and the grant of Swaraj in accordance with a scheme to be framed by authorised representatives of the nation.

What is Swaraj? That is the next question. It is partly answered in the foregoing paragraph. No one man can produce a swaraj scheme because it is not one man's swaraj that is wanted nor can a scheme be framed in advance. What may satisfy the nation to-day may not satisfy it to-morrow. Our evolution is and must be an organic growth. National will is therefore subject to change from day to-day. But some broad outlines can certainly be laid down in advance of Swaraj. The nation's representatives must have full control over education, law, police and military. We must have

full financial control. And if we are to be self-governing, not a soldier can leave India without our consent.

What about European Interests? They will be as safe in a self-governing India as they are to-day. But there will be no privileges of a superior race, no concessions and no exploitation. Englishmen will live as friends in every sense of the term but not as rulers.

And as to the British Connection, nobody so far as I am aware, wants to end it for the sake of ending it. There must be complete independence if England's policy is in conflict with the Muslim sentiment on the Khilafat question or with the Indian sentiment in the Punjab. In any case, it must be a partnership at will, based upon mutual love and esteem.

Is India ready for this? Time will show. I am convinced that it is. The Swaraj that the Congress demands is not one that is to be granted by England. It must be that which the nation demands, and can enforce, in the same sense that South Africa received it.

PART VIII

TOWARDS CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

PART VIII

TOWARDS CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

22nd September, 1921

THE LAST ACT

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

THE much talked of arrest* of Maulana Mahomed Ali took place at Waltair, whilst we were on our way to Madras. I am writing this in the train, just after writing out a few telegrams. The train halted at Waltair for over twenty five minutes. Maulana Mahomed Ali and I were going outside the station to address a meeting. Hardly had we gone a few paces from the entrance, when I heard the Maulana shouting to me and reading the notice given to him. I was a few paces in front of him. Two white men and half a dozen Indian police composed the party of arrest. The officer in charge would not let the Maulana finish reading the notice, but grasped his arm and took the Maulana away. With a smile on his lips he waved good-bye. I understood the

*Arrested under Secs. 107 and 108 Cr. P. C. only to be taken to Karachi to be tried under Secs. 121-A and 124-A, I. P. C. The arrest inaugurated a campaign of repression against the Non-co-operation movement which was intensified when the Prince of Wales arrived a few days later. *See* appendix.

meaning. I was to keep the flag flying. May God help me to prove worthy of the message of a Comrade with whom it was a privilege to work.

I continued my journey to the meeting place. I asked the people to remain calm, and fulfil the Congress programme. I then retraced my steps, and went where the Maulana was being detained. I asked the officer in charge whether I could see the Maulana. He said he had orders to let his wife and Secretary only meet him. I saw Begum Mahomed Ali and Secretary Mr. Hayat coming out of the detention room.

Waltair is a beauty spot in Andhra. It is a sanatorium. I envied the Maulana his arrest at such a lovely place. He was contemplating staying at Waltair a few days to rest and complete his accounts of the deputation. But the unexpectedly long stay in Bengal and the Moplah outbreak had rendered it impossible.

God had willed it otherwise. He wanted to give the Maulana enforced rest. And I know that he is happy in his detention.

Here is a copy of the warrant of arrest:

"To

F. E. CUNNINGHAM, ESQ.,
Deputy Inspector-General of Police,
C. I. D. and Railways, Madras.

Whereas Mahomed Ali is to be called on to show cause why he should not be bound over to keep the peace or to be of good behaviour for a period of one year under Secs. 107 and 108 Cr. P. C., you are hereby directed to arrest the said Mahomed Ali and produce him brfore me. Therein fail not. Dated the 14th day of September, 1921.

(Sd.) J. R. HUGGINS,
Dt. Magistrate, Vizagapatam."

Is it not funny that he, who has not only been himself peaceful, but has endeavoured, and that successfully, to

ensure peace among others and who has been a pattern of good behaviour, should be called upon by an insolent power to be 'bound over to keep the peace and be of good behaviour'? A Government that is evil has no room for good men and women except in its prisons.

What has happened to the younger is bound to happen to the elder brother.* They call themselves Siamese twins. They are inseparable. And if the one has misbehaved, the other undoubtedly has. I hope, that by the time this is in print, India would have learnt of the Maulana Shaukat Ali's arrest.

In imprisoning Maulana Mahomed Ali, the Government has imprisoned the Khilafat. For the two brothers are the truest representatives of the Khilafat. They cannot rest so long as the Khalifat remains practically a prisoner and their holy places virtually under non-Muslim control. The imprisonment of either or both means a flat refusal to recognise the Khilafat claim.

The Government will however find that they have not succeeded in imprisoning the spirit of the Brothers, and that the Khilafat struggle will rage all the fiercer for their imprisonment. The spirit of the Brothers will live in every true Hindu and Mussalman who will keep the Khilafat flame steady and shining.

But the Brothers to-day stand for more than the Khilafat. They want Swaraj and the redress of the Punjab wrong equally with the redress of the Khilafat wrong. They are too honourable to sell themselves even for securing the redress of the Khilafat wrong. To them the three are inextricably mixed up. It cannot well be otherwise, for to grant or to get the one is to grant or to get the other.

For me the imprisonment is a good omen. The

*Shaukat Ali was also subsequently arrested and taken to Karachi.

Government were playing with the thing so long as they were arresting the rank and file. Every Government that does not wish to yield to popular will is bound to arrest popular leaders and attempt to crush the popular spirit. With the Indian Government, it has become the code of honour to arrest and imprison leaders and yield to popular will when there is no grace left in the giving.

This imprisonment therefore may safely be regarded as a preliminary to the establishment of Swaraj. Only the Swaraj Parliament can unlock the gaol gate, and relieve the Brothers and their fellow prisoners with becoming honours. For this is a fight to the finish.

The best tribute we can pay the Brothers and their fellow prisoners is to throw away all doubts, fears and lethargy. We have been doubtful as to the value of non-violence and Swadeshi for attainment of our goal, and our ability to finish the programme within the year. We have entertained fear regarding our ability to undergo the necessary sacrifice, and we have been prosecuting our programme lazily. Let us imitate the courage, the faith, the fearlessness, the truthfulness, and the vigilant incessant activity of the Brothers, and we shall certainly attain Swaraj. 'Therein fail not' were the concluding words of the Magistrate's order. Well, the officer in charge 'failed not'. Many an English officer, be it said to his credit, has lost his life in trying not to fail. The Congress and the Khilafat command, mandate, advice, whatever it may be called, is 'Therein fail not.' Shall we, during the remaining period of grace, so work as to be able to report to the Congress, 'we have failed not'? The orders are clear:

(1) Be non-violent even under the greatest provocation.

(2) Preserve Hindu-Muslim unity even under the severest strain.

(3) Boycott the use of foreign cloth, even though you may have to be satisfied with the merest loin-cloth, and take to hand spinning, during every odd moment that can be spared.

When we have carried out these conditions, but not till then, are we ready to offer Civil Disobedience, that will compel obedience from the mightiest Government to a people's wish.

6th October, 1921

FREEDOM OF OPINION

The following Manifesto appeared in "Young India" of 6th October, 1921:

In view of the prosecution of the Ali Brothers and others for the reasons stated in the Government of Bombay Communique* dated the 15th September 1921, we, the undersigned, speaking in our individual capacity, desire to state that it is the inherent right of every one to express his opinion without restraint about the propriety of citizens offering their services to, or remaining in the employ of the Government, whether in the civil or the military department.

We, the undersigned, state it as our opinion, that it is contrary to national dignity for any Indian to serve as a civilian, and more especially as a soldier, under a system of Government, which has brought about India's economic, moral and political degradation and which has used the soldiery and the police for repressing national aspirations, as, for instance, at the time of the Rowlatt Act agitation, and which has used the soldiers for crushing the liberty of the Arabs, the Egyptians, the Turks and other nations who have done no harm to India.

* Omitted in this collection.

We are also of opinion that it is the duty of every Indian soldier and civilian to sever his connection with the Government and find some other means of livelihood.

M. K. Gandhi; Abul Kalam Azad, (Calcutta); Ajmal Khan, (Delhi); Lajpatrai, (Lahore); Motilal Nehru, (Allahabad); Sarojini Naidu, (Bombay); Abbas Taiyapji; N. C. Kelkar; V. J. Patel; Vallabhbhai J. Patel, (Ahmedabad); M. R. Jayakar, (Bombay); D. V. Gokhale, (Poona); S. G. Banker; Jawahirlal Nehru, (Allahabad); Gangadhar B. Deshpande, (Belgaum); Lakshmidas Tersi; Umar Sobani; Jamnalal Bajaj; M. S. Ane, (Amroti); S. E. Stokes, (Kotgarh, Simla); M. A. Ansari, (Delhi); Khaliquzzaman, (Delhi); K. M. Abdul Gafur, (Delhi); Abdul Bari, (Lucknow); Krishnaji Nilkanth, (Belgaum); C. Rajgopallachari, (Madras); Konda Venkatappayya, (Guntur); G. Harisarvottam Rao, (Guntur); Anasuya Sarabhai; Jitendralal Banerji; Mushir Husen Kidwai, (Delhi); Shyama Sundara Chakravarti, (Calcutta); Rajendra Prasad, (Patna); Azad Sobani, (Lucknow); Hazrat Mohani, (Cawnpore); Mahadeo Haribhai Desai; Barjorji Framji Bharucha; Yakub Hasan; B. S. Munje, (Nagpur); Jeramdas Dolatram; M. R. Cholkar, (Nagpur); V. V. Dartane, (Bhusaval); Ahmed Haji Sidick Khatri, (Bombay); Gudar Ramchandra Rao, (Andhra); D. S. Vijayarao, (Lahore); B. L. Subaramyaa, (Andhra); Mia Mahomed Haji Jan Mahomed Chhotani.*

6th October, 1921

EXPRESSION OF OPINION

Mahatma Gandhi wrote in "Young India" of the 6th October, under the above heading:

When in any movement violence is religiously eschewed, it becomes a propaganda movement of the purest type. Any attempt to crush it is an attempt to crush public opinion. And such the present repression

*In a subsequent issue of *Young India*, Mr. Gandhi stated that innumerable letters had been received by him requesting that the writer's name also be added to the list of signatories of the manifesto, including one from Mr. C. R. Das.

has become. Why should I not express my profound conviction,

(1) that it is sinful to serve the Government in any capacity whatsoever, especially that of a soldier,

(2) that it is sinful to drink intoxicating liquors,

(3) that it is sinful to wear foreign cloth,

(4) that it is sinful to gamble or speculate in food-stuffs or cotton?

The Government may, as it is carrying on a counter-propaganda, successfully draw recruits for civil and military employment, by various methods induce people to drink and wear foreign cloth and speculate in food-stuffs and cotton, and thus continue to govern so long as people intentionally or ignorantly co-operate with it. It will fall the day the people are convinced to the contrary. And just as I carry on my propaganda among the wine-bibbers and the cotton speculators to wean them from their evil ways, I claim the right to tell the soldier face to face what is his duty in accordance with my opinion. Why should the soldier be kept in ignorance of what is going on in the country? Is the Government afraid, that if he comes to know the truth he will no longer serve it? A Government worth the name should be able fully to educate the soldiery and hold its loyalty. But in India everything is armed,—peace, loyalty and opinion. Only the people are disarmed. Our duty therefore is clear. We must claim, even though it be on the gallows, to hold and openly to express any opinion we choose, so long as we do not directly or indirectly cause violence. That is the battle of Non-violent Non-co-operation. It must be fought to the finish. I warn the public that the prosecution for 'tampering with the loyalty of the army' is but the precursor of prosecutions for tampering with the loyalty

of the people to foreign cloth. What was the burning of the *Khadi* vests and caps of the young men of Calicut? What is the crusade against the students of the Vizagapatam Medical School, if it is not an insensate crusade against *Khadi*?

13th October, 1921

THE FEAR OF DEATH

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

I have been collecting descriptions of Swaraj. One of these would be: Swaraj is the abandonment of the fear of death. A nation which allows itself to be influenced by the fear of death cannot attain Swaraj, and cannot retain it if somehow attained.

English people carry their lives in their pockets. Arabs and Pathans consider death as nothing more than an ordinary ailment; they never weep when a relation dies. Boer women are perfectly innocent of this fear. In the Boer war, thousands of young Boer women became widowed. They never cared. It did not matter in the least if the husband or the son was lost; it was enough and more than enough that the country's honour was safe. What booted the husband if the country was enslaved? It was infinitely better to bury a son's mortal remains and to cherish his immortal memory than to bring him up as a serf. Thus did the Boer women steel their hearts and cheerfully give up their darlings to the angel of Death.

The people I have mentioned kill and get killed. But what of those who do not kill, but are only ready to die themselves? Such people become the objects of a world's adoration. They are the salt of the earth.

The English and Germans fought one another; they

killed and got killed. The result is that animosities have increased. There is no end of unrest, and the present condition of Europe is pitiful. There is more of deceit, and each is anxious to circumvent the rest.

But the fearlessness which we are cultivating is of a nobler and purer order and it is therefore that we hope to achieve a signal victory within a very short time.

When we attain Swaraj, many of us will have given up the fear of death; or else we shall not have attained Swaraj. Till now mostly young boys have died in the cause. Those who died in Aligarh were all below twenty-one. No one knew who they were. If Government resort to firing now, I am hoping that some men of the first rank will have the opportunity of offering up the supreme sacrifice.

Why should we be upset when children or young men or old men die? Not a moment passes when some one is not born or is not dead in this world. We should feel the stupidity of rejoicing in a birth and lamenting a death. Those who believe in the soul—and what Hindu, Musalman or Parsi is there who does not?—know that the soul never dies. The souls of the living as well as of the dead are all one. The eternal processes of creation and destruction are going on ceaselessly. There is nothing in it for which we might give ourselves up to joy or sorrow. Even if we extend the idea of relationship only to our countrymen and take all the births in the country as taking place in our own family, how many births shall we celebrate? If we weep for all the deaths in our country, the tears in our eyes would never dry. This train of thought should help us to get rid of all fear of death.

India, they say, is a nation of philosophers; and we have not been unwilling to appropriate the compliment

Still, hardly any other nation becomes so helpless in the face of death as we do. And in India again, no other community perhaps betrays so much of this helplessness as the Hindus. A single birth is enough for us to be beside ourselves with ludicrous joyfulness. A death makes us indulge in orgies of loud lamentation which condemn the neighbourhood to sleeplessness for the night. If we wish to attain Swaraj, and if having attained it, wish to make it something to be proud of, we must perfectly renounce this unseemly fright.

And what is imprisonment to the man who is fearless of death itself? If the reader will bestow a little thought upon the matter, he will find that if Swaraj is delayed, it, is delayed because we are not prepared calmly to meet death and inconveniences less than death.

As larger and larger numbers of innocent men come out to welcome death, their sacrifice will become the potent instrument for the salvation of all others; and there will be a minimum of suffering. Suffering cheerfully endured ceases to be suffering and is transmuted into an ineffable joy. The man who flies from suffering is the victim of endless tribulation before it has come to him, and is half dead when it does come. But one who is cheerfully ready for anything and everything that comes, escapes all pain; his cheerfulness acts as an anaesthetic.

I have been led to write about this subject, because we have got to envisage even death, if we will have Swaraj this very year. One who is previously prepared often escapes accidents; and this may well be the case with us. It is my firm conviction that Swadeshi constitutes this preparation. When once Swadeshi is a success, neither this Government nor any one else will feel the necessity of putting us to any further test.

Still it is best not to neglect any contingency whatever. Possession of power makes men blind and deaf; they cannot see things which are under their very nose, and cannot hear things which invade their ears. There is thus no knowing what this power-intoxicated Government may not do. So it seemed to me that patriotic men ought to be prepared for death, imprisonment and similar eventualities.

The brave meet death with a smile on their lips, but they are circumspect all the same. There is no room for foolhardiness in this non-violent war. We do not propose to go to gaol or to die by an immoral act. We must mount the gallows while resisting the oppressive laws of this Government. (Translated from the Gujarati *Navajivan* by D.)

8th December, 1921

IN EARNEST

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The arrest of Lala Lajpatrai and Messrs. Lalkhan, Santanam and Gopichand in the Punjab, of Messrs. Phooken and Bardolai in Assam, Babu Jitendralal Banerji in Bengal, Maulana Mohiuddin and others in Ajmer and Mr. Harkarannath Mishra and others in Lucknow means business.* It shows not merely that the Government is in earnest but that it is not going to tolerate Non-co-operation any longer; no longer is it a question of putting down violence, it is one of compelling co-operation. And this is as it should be. The Government had to appear in its true colours some day or other. No Prince had such welcome as is being offered to the

* For other measures and methods of repression, *see* appendix.

Prince of Wales. The chosen leaders of the people are being put away so that the latter may accept the lead of the Government and so that there may be no *hartal* on the day of the Prince's entry into the various provinces.

All this the Government of India, constituted as it is, has a right to do, and we non-co-operate because it claims and exercises such right on due occasion. The right consists in its imposing its will upon the people, not recognising that of the people to have their own way except on pain of being imprisoned. The issue is clear, and neatly summed up in the Lawrence statue whose removal the Government will not allow, although it is the property in law of the people. It must govern by the Pen or the Sword. Once more the choice has been offered to the people. Will they accept the honourable imposition of the Sword and reject the degrading dictation of the Pen?

The people cannot complain if after fifteen months' training they do not know what to do. Indeed the best thing they can do is to do nothing, *i.e.*, to remain as they were and continue as if nothing extraordinary had happened. England did not stop the war because Lord Kitchener died. 'Business as usual' was her motto. She was well organised for violence—well enough to do without a general or to find an endless succession of generals. Are we so well organised for Non-violence as to do without leaders, *i.e.*, have an endless succession of them?

In the person of Lala Lajpatrai the Government have arrested one of the greatest of us. His name is known all over India. His self-sacrifice has enshrined him in the hearts of his countrymen. He has laboured as very few have for non-violence side by side with the freest

expression and organisation of public opinion. His arrest typifies, as nothing else can, the attitude of the Government.

The Punjab has lost no time in choosing a successor.* The Punjabis could not have made a better choice than by electing Agha Safdar. He is one of the truest of Mussalmans and one of the bravest of Indians. His services are all rendered in a most unassuming manner. I have no doubt that he will command the same loyal co-operation that Lalaji has. The best honour that the Punjabis can do to Lalaji is to continue his work as if he was in their midst. It is blind, foolish and selfish love which dissolves with the dissappearance, permanent or temporary, of the earthy tabernacle which holds the deathless spirit. The Punjabis may not always get an Agha Safdar to guide them in the place of Lalaji. He may be removed from their midst sooner than we may expect. In well ordered organisations leaders are elected for convenience of work, not for extraordinary merit. A leader is only first among equals. Some one must be put first, but he is and should be no stronger than the weakest link in the chain. Having therefore made our selection we must follow him, or the chain is broken and all is loose.

I wish I could impart my faith to the people that nothing much remains to be done in order to take us to the heaven. The way is clear before us. The President-elect has stated it in unequivocal terms: 'My first word and my last word to you is never to forsake the ideal of Non-violent Non-co-operation. I know that sometimes the provocation is so great that it is extremely difficult to remain non-violent in thought, word and deed. The

* About the procedure that people should adopt in case of arrests and of conduct in jail, see *infra*.

success of the movement, however, depends upon this great principle.'

In order to enable us to enforce this great principle in our own lives, we must avoid all occasions for provocation. We therefore need no demonstrations now nor big meetings, we must discipline those who have become awakened to withstand provocation and to do constructive national work which is organisation of carding, hand-spinning and hand-weaving, so as to enable the nation to supplement her slender resources and to find work for the idle hours of the millions. Hindu-Muslim unity is an article of faith with us. It is not to be cultivated or demonstrated except by all working together for national uplift and, therefore, devoting their time exclusively to manufacture of *Khadi*.

As soon as we have attained a complete boycott of foreign cloth and begun to manufacture our own *Khadi* in our respective provinces and villages, we can become free probably without having to resort to mass Civil Disobedience. Therefore aggressive Civil Disobedience should be avoided, at least till after finishing the boycott of foreign cloth and qualifying for the manufacture of of handspun *Khadi*. Defensive Civil Disobedience which is forced on us in the prosecution of our campaign we ought to welcome, whenever it comes.

It will be a distinct sign of weakness and unfitness for Swaraj, if these imprisonments dishearten or demoralize us. He is no soldier who is afraid or unwilling to pay the toll demanded of him. The more he is called upon to pay, the more glad he is to find himself the first to have to pay. Let us believe and know that we must provide the Government gaols with all the work they can take. I am convinced that it is not argument but suffering of the innocent that appeals both to the

persecutor and the persecuted. The nation will shed her slothful indifference and the Governors their callousness by the sight of such suffering. But it must be the willing suffering of the strong and not the unwilling suffering of the helpless weak. Those who have gone or are about to go to goal can say, 'It is finished.' We who remain outside have to prove worthy of their finished work by continuing their work till we have set them free or have joined them. He serves best who suffers most.

15th December, 1921

DESHABANDHU DAS

Lord Reading has been as good as his word. The highest in the land has not been immune from arrest. Lord Ronaldshay had perhaps given the public to understand that he would not be arrested till after the Congress and, then too, if he did not behave himself. But Lord Reading's threat was later than, and therefore cancelled, the implied opinion of Lord Ronaldshay. Why should the President-elect be left free, if he enlisted volunteers and issued manifestoes? There was no cessation in the activity for bringing about *hartal* on the day of the Prince's arrival in Calcutta. It was some such reasoning, I suppose, that was applied in effecting the arrest of the President-elect. His arrest was accompanied by that of other prominent workers. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, one of the most learned among Mussalman divines, Maulvi Akramkhan, the Secretary of the Khilafat Committee, Mr. Sasmal, Secretary of the Provincial Congress Committee and Mr. Padmaraj Jain who exercised influence over the Marwadis were arrested with the President-elect. This must be obviously to prevent *hartal*. These

arrests mean that the authorities do not want to tolerate even quiet persuasion and canvassing. They want in fact a forcible opening of shops. They will not adopt the way of Colonel Johnson and threaten to open the shops and put soldiers in charge, but they wish to influence the timid shopkeepers by arresting their leaders. The merchants of Calcutta have now a chance of showing their determination and independence by observing complete *hartal* in spite of the withdrawal of leaders. It is more necessary than ever for the people now to observe *hartal* on the 24th. The idea of making a demonstration has now become a subsidiary object. The honour of their leaders requires the people of Calcutta to observe a complete *hartal*. It will be a proof of their confidence in their leaders and proof also of the exercise of their own free will. I am hoping that the people of Calcutta will not fail to do their obvious duty on the 24th instant. And now that their leaders are withdrawn from them, every non-co-operator will constitute himself a leader for keeping the peace. They cannot do better than simply keep themselves at home on the 24th except volunteers whose duty it will be to protect from harm those who may choose to open their shops. I assume that both the Congress and the Khilafat Committees have elected fresh office bearers. Our true test is certainly now. The assumption of leadership to-day is like the assumption of Lord Mayorship by the late Mac Swiney. It carries with it the liability for immediate imprisonment. If the nation is truly awakened, there should be a ceaseless flow of leaders and men and women to be led. Our supply must always be equal to the demand made upon us by the Government. We win when we have established sufficient credit for ourselves for being able to cope with the demand.

22nd December, 1921

THINGS THAT SINK

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

To imprison those who, whether high or low, break the commandments, to treat them as common felons, to deprive them of their prison privileges, one can understand. I would not call that foul play. If you incur the wrath of one who is over you or who has you under his power for the time being, to be punished by him for your disobedience is what you expect. But if he humiliates you, if he makes your children do things you and they do not like and which you are not required in law to do, if he treats you like dirt, it becomes unbearable. One learns that in Coconada a Magistrate had the Swaraj and the Khilafat flags pulled down, that he issued orders prohibiting the use of such flags for one week, that the children of a school were compelled to salute the Union Jack, that a distinguished Professor in Calcutta, going out in his academic costume and, on the strength thereof, going up to an officer to stop a wanton hunt of inoffensive men, was brutally assaulted for his innocent inquiry as to the cause of the hunt, that a party of brave cultured young men were kicked about by those who were their warders for the time being. These are things that sink. These humiliations show that there is little change in the manners of our 'masters'. The O'Dwyerian spirit has not died out. Of what use is it that Lord Ronaldshay sends for the injured Professor, soothes him and assures him that the thing will not happen again? What will not happen again? The Professor will not be assaulted? Of course he will not be during the present crisis. The Professor himself will not again presume upon his academic costume and challenge an

officer very soon. But has the officer any respect for the Professor? The Professor did not seek relief for himself. He interceded for injured humanity. Will Indian humanity be protected and respected in future because of his Lordship's assurance? It is the habitual training given to the soldier that matters. He is converted into a vicious animal to be let loose on harmless people on given occasions. The Dases and the Azads have gone to gaol to prevent a repetition of such unmanly and brutal exhibitions. They have welcomed imprisonment, in order that even the worst criminal may be protected against wanton injury, that even he may not have his self-respect wounded. They have not gone to gaol for any mechanical transference of power. The organic change they want, that Lala Lajpatrai has been pining for years, that has become the breath of life for the ease-loving Motilal Nehru and has made of him practically a Fakir, is not to be brought about by Lord Ronaldshay, however well-intentioned he may be in his apologies, nor by Lord Reading's smooth phrases and his personal care that officers and men might not overstep the limits of law. The organic change will be and can only be brought about by the suffering that has come to the people and for which, thank God, they find themselves prepared. A cautious friend in order to restrain my optimism tells me that the suffering has only just begun, that for the end in view we must pay a much higher price still. He really expects that we shall have to invite a repetition of Jallianwalas and that, instead of approaching the triangles of the crawling lane fame tremblingly and reluctantly, we shall have now to walk to them cheerfully and with a steady step and suffer lashes for refusing to crawl. I assure the friend that my optimism has room for all these things and much worse that he can

imagine. But I promise, too, that if India remains calm and unperturbed and does not retaliate even mentally—a very difficult process, I admit, and yet not so difficult in India's present exalted mood,—our very preparedness and consequent absence of re-action will exhaust the brute spirit for want of nutrition, and Lord Reading, instead of talking big things to us, will himself adopt the human language of penitence and see ample occasion in the Indian atmosphere for a new diplomacy. Whereas if we forget ourselves and our pledge, we must be ready for a thousand Jallianwalas and India, being turned into a vast shambles. The President-elect has prepared us for such a consummation. He is sure that we have shed the fear of the prison. He is almost certain probably from the experience of his brave son and his company that we will be prepared to undergo the ordeal of assaults. But he bids us give up the fear of death itself. If that time is in store for us, I hope that there will be non-violent Non-co-operators enough in India, of whom it will be written:

'They suffered bullets without anger and with prayer on their lips, even for the ignorant murderer.'

Well, if the reports are to be credited, two Assamese volunteers have been whipped, the volunteers of Lahore have meekly borne the wanton assaults committed on them. This fight is not a joke. We have disciplined ourselves for the past twelve months and more, and we must now go through it to the end. There is no turning back.

The following appeared in "Young India" of 17th December, 1921:

Viceroy's Share.—I am sorry that I suspect Lord

Reading of complicity in the plot to unman India for eternity. A friend has suggested an alternative. He says that, whilst Lord Reading must be held responsible for the threats used by him in his recent utterance, he might be quite unaware of the lawlessness of the subordinate official or that he must have become helpless, the subordinate officials having simply disregarded his wishes to be strictly within the law. I must reject both the interpretations. Lord Reading, if he is trying legitimately to suppress popular lawlessness, must study and regulate the development of his campaign which he will not even allow to be called repression. If his subordinates being interested parties have gone out of hand, he must forthwith resign, at least publicly disown and condemn such illegalities and assaults and not attempt to excuse them on the flimsy plea of 'trying times.' I have myself suggested a possible explanation. His Excellency sympathises with our aspirations, and knowing his own countrymen, realises that we have got to be severely tried before they think of coming to terms; he is therefore trying and directing repression to see how far we are capable of bearing it and therefore sincere in our desire for freedom, and then having made out a case for us his clients, desires to compel a settlement. I am afraid, however, that I have to state the case only to be rejected. Human nature does not work quite that way. Lord Reading is not so entirely selfess, and if he is, he cannot possibly remain in charge of a Government which under its present constitution can give no relief to the people. It is therefore with the greatest reluctance that I am forced to conclude that Lord Reading is trying to emasculate India by forcibly making free speech and popular organisation impossible. I am prepared to believe that, in all this, he thinks that he is doing good

to us and that we are not yet fit to be called men and women. He will soon have his eyes opened. We must not quarrel with his belief. Nor need we feel anxious about it. Let us acquit ourselves like men and women, and we shall find that everything and everybody become favourable to us.

22nd December, 1921

ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE

The pages of "Young India" are rarely occupied with an examination of what rulers think. It is an idle speculation. But as the papers are discussing, advising and debating upon such a conference, I have considered it appropriate to devote some space to an examination of the mentality of the chief actor in the drama, now being played in India. In my opinion such a conference is bound to prove abortive, till Lord Reading is disabused of the idea that Non-co-operation is confined to a few misguided zealots. If he wants co-operation and contentment, he must placate Non-co-operators. He must see that Non-co-operation is not the disease, it is the chief symptom of a disease. The disease consists in a triple injury to the people of India. And no palliative will soothe the patient so long as the centre of the disease is not tackled. Outside the redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and the grant of Swaraj in accordance with a scheme framed by the chosen representatives of the people, repression is the easiest and the shortest way to a settlement. No Viceroy can, I freely confess, possibly allow things to drift. I admit that he must suppress civil disobedience as he would an armed rebellion unless he is prepared to remedy the evil towards which the disobedience is

directed. Abstract truth has no value, unless it incarnates in human beings who represent it by proving their readiness to die for it. Our wrongs live because we only pretend to be their living representatives. The only way we can prove our claim is by readiness to suffer in the discharge of our trust. We are on a fair way to proving ourselves worthy of it. But I hardly think we can yet claim to have given conclusive proof. Who knows if we shall not be found wanting when imprisonment means utter discomfort, and even lashes? Who knows how many of us are ready to mount the gallows?

In my opinion, therefore, a conference at which the Government is represented will be useful only when the latter has tried the Non-co-operators to its satisfaction and measured their strength in quantity and quality.

But since Non-co-operation is a method of cultivating public opinion, I would certainly welcome a conference of co-operators and Non-co-operators. I am sure that they want the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs redressed, I am aware that they want freedom for the country as much as Non-co-operators. It has given me much pleasure to see almost every moderate journal condemning the present repressive policy of the Government. I had expected nothing less. And I know that, if Non-co-operators keep self-restraint, do not become violent, do not abuse their opponents, every liberal will become a Non-co-operator. Indeed even Englishmen will veer round to the Non-co-operators and the Goverment will, as it then must, capitulate. That is the expected and intended working of the method of Non-co-operation. It reduces friction to a minimum. And, if to-day it seems to have produced a contrary effect, it is because Non-co-operators have only now begun to see that it is

not enough to have been fairly Non-violent in deed. It is equally necessary to be Non-violent in word and thought. It is unlawful for a Non-co-operator even to wish ill to his enemies. What our opponents dread most is undisciplined violence breaking out under cover of Non-violence. They do not believe in our sincerity, *i.e.*, of the vast majority of us. They see in it nothing but chaos and perdition. This repression therefore has come as a blessing in disguise. It is showing them and us that we have acquired influence over the populace to keep it under check even under provoking circumstances. Our restraint has not yet been tried long enough to be considered permanent. We are still in a state of uncertainty. The people in Sialkot did stray away from the line, be it ever so slightly. We have had so many such little jerks that we do not possess the sense of security required to inspire an outsider's faith in the movement. I would therefore welcome every opportunity of meeting the co-operators on neutral ground or for showing the *bona fides* of Non-co-operators. The Government has shown itself in true colours by declaring its intention to suppress Non-co-operation as such. It was on safe ground so long as it sought to put down violence or incitement to or approval of it. I have therefore no doubt that the co-operators will rise to a man against the Government madness—this vain attempt to stifle expression of opinion and agitation for redress of grievances. But I warn our friends against entertaining the idea of a conference with the Government till they find that it is truly penitent and means to appreciate the popular side. Let there be no conference on the boycott of welcome or the right of holding public meetings or forming associations of volunteers or others so long as they have no violent purpose. Boycott of the

welcome will and must continue so long as the people's wishes are flouted, and public meetings and associations are elementary rights on which there can be no parleying. We must fight for them.

Let it be understood that Non-co-operators are not offering Civil Disobedience that they had intended to. Their insistence on calling and attending public meetings and forming peaceful volunteer associations ought not to be dignified by the name of Civil Disobedience. Non-co-operators are merely on the defensive. They have not taken, as they certainly intend to take, the offensive as soon as they are fairly certain of non-violent atmosphere. The Government has obliged them by anticipating them and providing them with a test of their own capacity.

22nd December, 1921

THE PROPOSED CONFERENCE

Referring to Lord Ronaldshay's speech at the Bengal Legislative Council on Monday last, Mr. Gandhi made the following statement to the correspondent of the Associated Press at his Ashram late in the night: I have read Lord Ronaldshay's speech* in the Bengal Legislative Council. Whilst I appreciate the note of conciliation about it, I cannot help saying that it is most misleading. I do not want to criticise those parts of the speech which lend themselves to criticism. I simply want to say that the present situation is entirely his own and the Viceroy's doing. In spite of my strong desire to avoid suspecting the Government of India and the Local Governments of a wish to precipitate a conflict

* Omitted in this collection.

with the people, up to now all that I heard and read leads me to the conclusion that my suspicion is justified. Whilst I do not wish to deny the existence of some sort of pressure, even intimidation, on the part of individuals, I do wish emphatically to deny that in connection with the phenomenal *hartal* on the 17th November in Calcutta, there was any intimidation, organised or initiated by or on behalf of the Local Congress or the Khilafat Committees. On the contrary, I am certain that the influence exerted by both these bodies was in the direction of avoiding all intimidation. Moral pressure there certainly was and will always be in all big movements, but it must be clear to the simplest understanding that a complete *hartal* such as Calcutta witnessed on the 17th November would be an impossibility by mere intimidation. But assume that there was intimidation. Was there any reason for disbanding Volunteer Corps, prohibiting public meetings and enforcing laws which are under promise of repeal? Why has no attempt been made to prove a single case of intimidation? It grieves me to have to say that the Governor of Bengal has brought in the discovery of swords or sword-sticks in one place in Calcutta to discredit large public organisations. Who intimidated the people into observing a complete *hartal* in Allahabad after all the leaders were arrested and in spite of the reported undue official pressure that was exercised upon shopkeepers and ghariwallas at that place? Again, His Lordship says, "If we are to assume that this development means there is genuine desire to bring about improvement, there must be a favourable atmosphere. In other words, it will be generally agreed that to trust must be an essential preliminary to any possible conference. If responsible leaders of Non-co-operation now come forward with

definite assurance that this is the correct interpretation, I should then say we were in sight of such a change of circumstances as would justify Government in reconsidering the position. But words must be backed by deeds. If I were satisfied only that there was general desire for the conference and that responsible Non-co-operation leaders were prepared to take action, then I should be prepared to recommend my Government to take steps in consonance with the altered situation." This is highly misleading. If wherever words "Non-co-operation leaders" occur, the word "Government" were put in, and if the whole of the statement came from a Non-co-operator, it would represent the correct situation. Non-co-operators have really to do nothing, for they have precipitated nothing. They are over-cautious. The disturbance in Bombay was allowed to override their keen desire to take up aggressive Civil Disobedience, but in the present circumstances the phrase "Civil Disobedience" is really a misnomer. What Non-co-operators are doing to-day, I claim, every co-operator would do to-morrow under similar circumstances. When the Government of India or the Local Governments attempt to make our political existence or agitation, no matter how peaceful, an utter impossibility, may we not resist such attempt by every lawful means at our disposal? I cannot imagine anything more lawful or more natural than that we should continue our volunteer organisations purging them of every tendency to become violent and continue also to hold public meetings taking the consequences of such a step. Is it not proof of the law-abiding instinct of hundreds of young men and old men that they have meekly, without offering any defence and without complaining, accepted imprisonment for having dared to exercise their elementary rights in the face of Govern-

ment persecution? And so it is the Government which is to prove its genuine desire for a conference and an ultimate settlement. It is the Government which has to arrest the fatal course along which repression is taking it. It is the Government that is to prove to Non-co-operators its *bona fides* before it can expect them to take part in any conference. When the Government does that, it will find that there is an absolutely peaceful atmosphere. Non-co-operation, when the Government is not resisting anything except violence, is a most harmless thing. There is really nothing for us to suspend. We cannot be expected, until there is actual settlement or guarantee of settlement, to ask schoolboys to return to Government schools or lawyers to resume practice or public men to become candidates for the Councils or title-holders to ask for return of titles. In the nature of things, it is therefore clear that Non-co-operators have to do nothing. Speaking personally, I can certainly say that if there is a genuine desire for a conference, I would be the last person to advise precipitating aggressive Civil Disobedience, which certainly it is my intention to do immediately I am entirely satisfied that the people have understood the secret of non-violence; and let me say the last ten days' events have shown that the people seem clearly to understand its inestimable value. If then the Government recognises that Non-co-operators mean business and intend to suffer limitlessly for the attainment of their goal, let the Government unconditionally retrace its steps, cancel the notifications about disbandment of volunteer organisations and prohibition of public meetings and release all those men in the different provinces who have been arrested and sentenced for so-called Civil Disobedience or for any other purpose given under the definition of Non-co-

operation but excluding acts of violence, actual or intended. Let the Government come down with a heavy hand on every act of violence or incitement to it, but we must claim the right for all time of expressing our opinions freely and educating public opinion by every legitimate and non-violent means. It is therefore the Government who have really to undo the grave wrong they have perpetrated and they can have the conference they wish in a favourable atmosphere. Let me also say that, so far as I am concerned, I want no conference to consider the ways and means of dealing with Non-co-operation. The only conference that can at all avail at this stage is a conference called to deal with the causes of the present discontent, namely the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and Swaraj. Any conference again which can usefully sit at the present stage must be conference that is really representative and not a conference to which only those whom the Government desire are invited.

19th January, 1922

THE VICEROY'S REPLY

Interviewed by Associated Press correspondent, Mr. Gandhi made the following statement regarding Lord Reading's speech at Calcutta in reply to the deputation led by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya : I must confess that I have read the Viceregal utterance with deep pain. I was totally unprepared for what I must respectfully call his mischievous misrepresentation of the attitude of the Congress and the Khilafat organisations in connection with the visit of His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales. Every resolution passed by either organisation

and every speaker has laid the greatest stress upon the fact that there was no question of showing the slightest ill-will against the Prince or exposing him to any affront. The boycott was purely a question of principle and directed against what we have held to be the unscrupulous methods of the bureaucracy. I have always held, as I hold even now, that the Prince has been brought to India in order to strengthen the hold of the Civil Service corporation which has brought India into a state of abject pauperism and political serfdom. If I am proved to be wrong in my supposition that the visit has that sinister meaning, I shall gladly apologise.

It is equally unfortunate for the Viceroy to say that the boycott of the welcome means an affront to the British people. His Excellency does not realise what grievous wrong he is doing to his own people by confusing them with the British administrators in India. Does he wish India to infer that the British administrators here represent the British people and that agitation directed against their methods is an agitation against the British people? And if such is the Viceregal contention and if to conduct a vigorous and effective agitation against the methods of bureaucracy and to describe them in their true colours is an affront to the British people, then I am afraid I must plead guilty. But then I must also say in all humility, the Viceroy has entirely misread and misunderstood the great national awakening that is taking place in India. I repeat for the thousandth time that it is not hostile to any nation or any body of men, but it is deliberately aimed at the system under which the Government of India is being to-day conducted, and I promise that no threat and no enforcement of threats by the Viceroy or any body of men will strangle that agitation or send to rest that awakening.

I have said in my reply to Lord Ronaldshay's speech that we have not taken the offensive; we are not the aggressors, we have not got to stop any single activity. It is the Government that is to stop its aggravatingly offensive activity aimed not at violence but a lawful. disciplined, stern but absolutely non-violent agitation, It is for the Government of India and for it alone to bring about a peaceful atmosphere, if it so desires. It has hurled a bomb-shell in the midst of material rendered inflammable by its own action and wonders that the material is still not inflammable enough to explode. The immediate issue is not now the redress of the three wrongs; the immediate issue is the right of holding public meetings and the right of forming associations for peaceful purposes. And in vindicating this right we are fighting the battle not merely on behalf of Non-co-operators, but we are fighting the battle for all schools of politics. It is the condition of any organic growth, and I see in the Viceregal pronouncement an insistence upon submission to a contrary doctrine which an erstwhile exponent of the law of liberty has seen fit to lay down upon finding himself in an atmosphere where there is little regard for law and order on the part of those very men who are supposed to be custodians of law and order. I have only to point to the unprovoked assaults being committed, not in isolated cases, not in one place, but in Bengal, in the Punjab, in Delhi and in the United Provinces. I have no doubt that as repression goes on in its mad career, the reign of terrorism will overtake the whole of this unhappy land. But whether the campaign is conducted on civilised or uncivilised lines, so far as I can see, there is only one way open to Non-co-operators, indeeed I contend, even to the people of India. On this question of the right of holding public meetings and

forming associations there can be no yielding. We have burnt our boats and we must sail onward till that primary right of human beings is vindicated.

Let me make my own position clear. I am most anxious for a settlement. I want a Round Table Conference. I want our position to be clearly known by everybody who wants to understand it. I impose no conditions, but when conditions are imposed upon me prior to the holding of a conference, I must be allowed to examine those conditions, and if I find that they are suicidal, I must be excused if I don't accept them. The amount of tension that is created can be regulated solely by the Government of India, for the offensive has been taken by that Government.

19th January, 1922

THE MALAVIYA CONFERENCE

(By M. K. Gandhi)

The Conference* was both a success and a failure. It was a success in that it showed an earnest desire on the part of those who attended to secure a peaceful solution of the present trouble, and in that it brought under one roof people possessing divergent views. It was a failure in that, though certain resolutions have been adopted, the Conference did not leave on my mind the impression that those who assembled together as a whole realised the gravity of the real issue. The mind of the Conference

* A conference of leaders of all parties, arranged by Pandit Malaviya, was held in Bombay on 14th January 1922, at which over a hundred leaders of all parties from all provinces were present. It recommended stopping of repression and the convoking of a round table conference between Government and Non-co-operators and other leaders. Government rejected the proposals. For further details *see* appendix.

seemed to be centred more on a round table conference than upon asserting the popular right of free speech, free association and free press which are more than a round table conference. I had expected on the part of the Independents to declare their firm attitude that no matter how much they might differ regarding the method of Non-co-operation, the freedom of the people was a common heritage and that the assertion of that right was three-fourths of Swaraj; that therefore they would defend that right even with Civil Disobedience, if need be.

However, as the attention of the Conference could not be rivetted on that point, but on a round table conference, the discussion turned upon the essentials of such a conference.

My own position was clear. I would attend any conference as an individual, without any conditions. My purpose as a reformer is to convert people to the view I hold to be right and therefore to see everybody who would care to listen to me. But when I was asked to mention the conditions necessary for an atmosphere favourable for a successful conference, I had to press home certain conditions. And I must own that the Resolutions Committee approached my view-point with the greatest sympathy and showed every anxiety to accommodate me. But side by side with this, I observed an admirable disposition on its part to consider the Government's difficulties. Indeed the Government's case could not have been better presented, if it had been directly and officially represented in the Conference.

The result was a compromise. The withdrawal of notifications and the discharge of prisoners coming under the notifications and of the *fatwa* prisoners, *i.e.*, the Ali Brothers and others, who have been convicted in respect of the *fatwas* regarding military service, was

common cause. The Committee saw the force of the suggestions that the distress warrants should be discharged, the fines imposed upon the Press, etc. should be refunded and that the prisoners convicted for non-violent or otherwise innocent activities under cover of the ordinary laws should be discharged upon the proof of their Non-violence. For this purpose, I had suggested the committee appointed by the conference. But on the Resolutions Committee showing that it would be difficult for the Government to accept such an uncontrolled recommendation, I agreed to the principle of arbitration now imported in the resolution. The second compromise is regarding picketing. My suggestion was that in the event of the round table conference being decided upon, Non-co-operation activities of a hostile nature should be suspended and that all picketing except *bona fide* peaceful picketing should also be suspended, pending result of the conference. As the implications of hostile activities appeared to me to be too dangerous to be acceptable, I hastily withdrew my own wording and gladly threw over even *bona fide* peaceful picketing, much though I regretted it. I felt that the friends interested in liquor picketing for the sake of temperance would not mind the temporary sacrifice.

I agreed too to advise the Working Committee to postpone general mass Civil Disobedience comtemplated by the Congress to the 31st instant in order to enable the Committee and the Conference to enter into negotiations with the Government. This, I felt, was essential to show our *bona fides*. We could not take up new offensives, whilst negotiations for a conference were being conducted by responsible men. I further undertook to advise the Committee in the event of the proposed conference coming off, to stop all *hartals* pending the conference.

This I hold to be inevitable. *Hartals* are a demonstration against bureaucracy. We cannot continue them, if we are conferring with them for peace. Workers will bear in mind that as yet no activity of the Congress stops save general Civil Disobedience. On the contrary, enlistment of volunteers and Swadeshi propaganda must continue without abatement. Liquor shop picketing may continue where it is absolutely peaceful. It should certainly continue where notices unnecessarily prohibiting picketing have been issued. So may picketing continue regarding schools or foreign cloth shops. But whilst all our activities should be zealously continued, there should be the greatest restraint exercised and every trace of violence or discourtesy avoided. When restraint and courtesy are added to strength, the latter becomes irresistible. Civil Disobedience being an indefeasible right, the preparations for it will continue even if the conference comes off. And the preparations for Civil Disobedience consist in:

1. the enlistment of volunteers,
2. the propaganda of Swadeshi,
3. the removal of untouchability,
4. the training in non-violence in word, deed and thought,
5. unity beetween diverse creeds and classes.

I hear that many are enrolled as volunteers in various parts of India, although they do not wear *Khadi*, do not believe in complete non-violence, or, if they are Hindus, do not believe in untouchability as a crime against humanity. I cannot too often warn the people that every deviation from our own rules retards our progress. It is the quality of our work which will please God and not quantity. Not all the lip Mussalmans and the lip Hindus will enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Islam is no stronger

than the Kingdom of Heaven. Islam is no stronger than the best Mussalman. Thousands of nominal followers of Hinduism belie their faith and discredit it. One true and perfect follower of Hinduism is enough to protect it for all time and against the whole world. Similarly, one true and perfect Non-co-operator is any day better than a million Non-co-operators so-called. The best preparation for Civil Disobedience is to cultivate civility, that is truth and non-violence, amongst ourselves and our surroundings.

An Unfortunate Incident.—The abrupt withdrawal of Sir Sankaran Nair* was an unfortunate incident. In my opinion, he had nothing to do with my, or later, with Mr. Jinnah's opinions. As Speaker, especially, he was exempt from any implied or express identification with anybody's views. I cannot help feeling that Sir Sankaran erred in the conception of his duty as speaker. But as we progress towards democracy, we must be prepared even for such erroneous exercise of independence. I congratulate Sir Sankaran Nair upon his boldly exercising his independence, which I have not hesitated to call cussedness in private conversation and upon the independence of the Committee in not suffering a nervous collapse, but quietly electing Sir Vishveshwarayya and voting thanks to the retiring Speaker for the services rendered.

* Sir Sankaran was the speaker of the Bombay Leaders' Conference on the first day, retired the second day alleging that in view of Mr. Gandhis attitude, there was no use for a conference.

19th January, 1922

THE DEMANDS

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

In order that all may approach the round table conference with perfect knowledge of the Congress demands, I laid all our cards on the table and reiterated the claims regarding the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj. Let me repeat them here:

(1) So far as I can write from memory, full restoration to the Turks of Constantinople, Adrianople, Anatolia including Smyrna and Thrace. Complete withdrawal of non-Muslim influence from Arabia, Mesopotamia, Palestine and therefore Syria and withdrawal of British troops whether English or Indian from these territories.

(2) Full enforcement of the report of the Congress Sub-Committee and therefore the stopping of the pensions of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, General Dyer and other officers named in the report for dismissal.

(3) Swaraj means, in the event of the foregoing demands being granted, full dominion status. The scheme of such Swaraj should be framed by representatives duly elected in terms of the Congress Constitution. That means four annas franchise. Every Indian adult, male or female, paying four annas and signing the Congress creed, will be entitled to be placed on the electoral roll. These electors would elect delegates who would frame the Swaraj constitution. This shall be given effect to without any change by the British Parliament.

If the Congress programme is so cut and dried, where is the necessity for a conference?—asks the critic. I hold that there is and there always will be.

The method of execution of the demands has to be

considered. The Government may have a reasonable and a convincing answer on the claims. The Congressmen have fixed their minimum, but the fixing of the minimum means no more than confidence in the justice of one's cause. It further means that there is no room for bargaining. There can, therefore, be no appeal to one's weakness or incapacity. The appeal can only be addressed to reason. If the Viceroy summons the conference, it means either that he recognises the justice of the claims or hopes to satisfy the Congressmen, among others, of the injustice thereof. He must be confident of the justice of his proposals for a rejection or reduction of the claim. That is my meaning of a meeting of equals who eliminate the idea of force, and instantly shift their ground as they appreciate the injustice of their position. I assure His Excellency the Viceroy and everybody concerned that the Congressmen or Non-co-operators are as reasonable beings as may be found on earth or in India. They have every incentive to be so for theirs is the duty of suffering as a result of rejection of any just offer.

I have heard it urged that on the Khilafat the Imperial Government is powerless. I should like to be convinced of this. In that case and if the Imperial Government make common cause with the Mussalmans of India, I should be quite satisfied and take the chance with the Imperial Government's genuine assistance of convincing the other powers of the justice of the Khilafat claim. And even when the claim is admitted, much requires to be discussed regarding the execution.

Similarly regarding the Punjab. The principle being granted, the details have to be settled. Legal difficulties have been urged about stopping the pensions to the dismissed officials. The reader may not know that Maulana Shaukat Ali's pension (I suppose he occupied

the same status as Sir Michael O'Dwyer) was stopped without any inquiry or previous notice to him. I believe that service regulations do provide for removing officers and officials from the pensions list on proof of gross neglect of duty or disloyal service. Anyway, let the Government prove a case for refusal to grant the Punjab demand save the plea of the past services of these officials. I must refuse to weigh their service to the Empire against their disservice to India, assuming the possibility of two such things co-existing.

Swaraj scheme is undoubtedly a matter on which there will be as many minds as there are men and women. And it is eminently a thing to be debated in a conference. But here again there must be a clean mind and no mental reservations. India's freedom must be the supreme interest in every body's mind. There should be no obstruction such as the preoccupation of the British elector or the indifference of the House of Commons or the hostility of the House of Lords. No lover of India can possibly take into account these extraneous matters. The only question to consider will be —is India ready for what she wants? Or does she ask like a child for food she has no stomach for? That can be determined not by outsiders but by Indians themselves.

From that standpoint, I do consider the idea of the conference for devising a scheme of full Swaraj premature. India has not yet incontestably proved her strength. Her suffering is great indeed, but nothing and not prolonged enough for the object in view. She has to go through greater discipline. I was punctiliously careful not to make Non-co-operators party to the conference resolutions, because we are still so weak. When India has evolved disciplined strength, I would knock myself at the Viceregal door for a conference, and I know that the

Viceroy will gladly embrace the opportunity whether he be an eminent lawyer or a distinguished militarist. I do not approach directly, because I am conscious of our weakness. But being humble I make it clear through Moderate or other friends that I would miss not a single opportunity of having honest conferences or consultations. And so I have not hesitated to advise non-co-operators thankfully to meet the Independents and place our services at their disposal to make such use of them as they may deem fit. And if the Viceroy or a party desires a conference it would be foolish for non-co-operators not to respond. The case of non-co-operators depends for success on cultivation of public opinion and public support. They have no other force to back them. I they forfeit public opinion, they have lost the voice of God for the time being.

For the manner of preparing the scheme too, I have simply suggested what appears to me to be a most feasible method. The All-India Congress Committee has not considered it nor has the Working Committee. The adoption of the Congress franchise is my own suggestion. But what I have laid down as the guiding principle is really unassailable. The scheme of Swaraj is that scheme which popular representatives frame. What happens then to the experts in administration and others who may not be popularly elected? In my opinion, they also should attend and have the vote even, but they must necessarily be in a minority. They must expect to influence the majority by a constant appeal to the logic of facts. Given mutual trust and mutual respect, a round table conference cannot but result in a satisfactory and honourable peace.

7th July, 1920

PURE CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

ALL the readers of "Young India" may not know that Ahmedabad came under a heavy fine for the misdeeds of the April of last year.* The fine was collected from the residents of Ahmedabad but some were exempted at the discretion of the collector. Among those who were called upon to pay the fines were income-tax payers. They had to pay a third of the tax paid by them. Mr. V. J. Patel, a noted barrister, and Dr. Kanuga, a leading medical practitioner, were among those who were unable to pay. They had admittedly helped the authorities to quell the disturbance. No doubt they were Satyagrahis, but they had endeavoured to still the mob fury even at some risk to their own persons. But the authorities would not exempt them. It was a difficult thing for them to use discretion in individual cases. It was equally difficult for these two gentlemen to pay any fine when they were not to blame at all. They did not wish to embarass the authorities and yet they were anxious to preserve their self-respect. They carried on no agitation but simply notified their inability to pay the fines in the circumstances set forth above. Therefore an attachment was issued. Dr. Kanuga is a very busy practitioner and his box is always full. The watchful attaching official attached his cash box and extracted enough money to discharge the writ of execution. A lawyer's business cannot be conducted on those lines. Mr. Patel sported on cash box. A sofa of his sitting room was therefore attached and advertised for sale and duly sold. Both these Satyagrahis have thus completely saved their consciences.

*See p. 15

Wiseacres may laugh at the folly of allowing writs of attachment and paying for the collection of fines. Multiply such instances and imagine the consequence to the authorities of executing thousands of writs. Writs are possible when they are confined to a few recalcitrants. They are troublesome when they have to be executed against many high-souled persons who have done no wrong and who refuse payment to vindicate a principle. They may not attract much notice when isolated individuals resort to this method of protest. But clean examples have a curious method of multiplying themselves. They bear publicity and the sufferers instead of incurring odium receive congratulations. Men like Thoreau brought about the abolition of slavery by their personal examples. Says Thoreau: "I know this well, that if one thousand, if one hundred, if ten men whom I could name,—if ten *honest* men only—aye, if *one* honest man, in this state of Massachusettes *ceasing to hold slaves* were actually to withdraw from this co-partnership and be locked up in the country gaol therefor, it would be the abolition of slavery in America. For it matters not how small the beginning may seem to be, what is once well done is done for ever." Again, he says, "I have contemplated the imprisonment of the offender rather than seizure of his goods—though both will serve the same purpose, because they who assert the purest right and consequently are most dangerous to a corrupt State, commonly have not spent much time in accumulating property." We therefore congratulate Mr. Patel and Dr. Kanuga on the excellent example set by them in an excellent spirit and in an excellent cause.

3rd November, 1921

REQUISITE CONDITIONS

Those only can take up Civil Disobedience, who believe in willing obedience even to irksome laws imposed by the state so long as they do not hurt their conscience or religion, and are prepared equally willingly to suffer the penalty of Civil Disobedience. Disobedience to be civil has to be absolutely non-violent, the underlying principle being the winning over of the opponent by suffering, *i.e.*, love.

For the purpose of the Khilafat, the Punjab or Swaraj civil resisters must implicitly believe in the necessity of Hindu-Muslim unity based not upon expediency but upon real affection. Civil resisters must believe in Swadeshi and therefore use only handspun. Humanly speaking, if not even one out of the two hundred and fifty districts of India is thus ready, I consider the attainment of Swaraj during this year nearly impossible. If one district can be found where ninety per cent of the population have completely boycotted foreign cloth and are manufacturing all the cloth required by them by hand spinning and hand weaving, if the whole of the population of that district, whether Hindu, Mussalman, Parsi, Sikh, Christian or Jewis, his living in perfect amity, if the whole of its Hindu population is purged of the sin of untouchability and if at least one in every ten of its inhabitants is capable of suffering imprisonment or even mounting the gallows, and if, while that district is civilly, peacefully and honourably resisting the Government, the rest of India remains non-violent and united and prosecutes the programme of Swadeshi, I hold it to be perfectly possible to establish Swaraj during this year. I shall hope that there are several such districts ready. In any

case, the method now to adopt is for workers to concentrate on and develop their own districts without reference to the rest. They must not invite imprisonment till they are ready, nor must they avoid it if it comes to them unsought. They should make no speeches but simply finish the Swadeshi programme in a businesslike manner. Where workers find no response from their districts, they must not get disheartened but should simply become expert carders, spinners and weavers. Their out-turn will be their best and whole work whilst their neighbours are thinking what to do.

10th November, 1921

THE MOMENTOUS ISSUE

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The next few weeks should see Civil Disobedience in full working order in some part of India. With illustrations of partial and individual Civil Disobedience the country has become familiar. Complete Civil Disobedience is rebellion without the element of violence in it. An out and out civil resister simply ignores the authority of the state. He becomes an outlaw claiming to disregard every unmoral state law. Thus, for instance, he may refuse to pay taxes, he may refuse to recognise the authority of the state in his daily intercourse. He may refuse to obey the law of trespass and claim to enter military barracks in order to speak to the soldiers, he may refuse to submit to limitations upon the manner of picketing and may picket within the prescribed area. In doing all this, he never uses force and never resists force when it is used against him. In fact, he invites imprisonment and other uses

of force against himself. This he does, because, and when he finds the bodily freedom he seemingly enjoys to be an intolerable burden. He argues to himself that a state allows personal freedom only in so far as the citizen submits to its regulations. Submission to the state law is the price a citizen pays for his personal liberty. Submission, therefore, to a state wholly or largely unjust is an immoral barter for liberty. A citizen who thus realises the evil nature of a state is not satisfied to live on its sufferance, and therefore appears to the others who do not share his belief to be a nuisance to society, whilst, he is endeavouring to compel the state without committing a moral breach to arrest him. Thus considered, civil resistance is a most powerful expression of a soul's anguish and an eloquent protest against the continuance of an evil state. Is not this the history of all reform? Have not reformers, much to the disgust of their fellows, discarded even innocent symbols associated with an evil practice?

When a body of men disown the state under which they have hitherto lived, they nearly establish their own government. I say nearly, for they do not go to the point of using force when they are resisted by the state. Their 'business' as of the individual is to be locked up or shot by the state, unless it recognises their separate existence, in other words bows to their will. Thus three thousand Indians in South Africa, after due notice to the Government of the Transvaal, crossed the Transvaal border in 1914 in defiance of the Transvaal immigration law and compelled the Government to arrest them. When it failed to provoke them to violence or to coerce them into submission, it yielded to their demand. A body of civil resisters is, therefore, like an army subject to all the discipline of a soldier, only harder because of

want of excitement of an ordinary soldier's life. And as a civil resistance army is or ought to be free from passion because free from the spirit of retaliation, it requires the fewest number of soldiers. Indeed one *perfect* civil resister is enough to win the battle of Right against Wrong.

Though, therefore, the All-India Congress Committee has authorised Civil Disobedience by Provincial Congress Committees on their own responsibility, I hope they will put due emphasis on the word 'responsibility' and not start Civil Disobedience with a light heart. Every condition must be given its full effect. The mention of Hindu-Muslim unity, non-violence, Swadeshi and removal of untouchability means that they have not yet become an integral part of our national life. If an individual or a mass have still misgivings about Hindu-Muslim unity, if they have still any doubt about the necessity of non-violence for the attainment of our triple goal, if they have not yet enforced swadeshi in its completeness, if the Hindus among that mass have still the poison of untouchability in them, that mass or that individual are not ready for Civil Disobedience. Indeed it would be best to watch and wait whilst the experiment is being carried on in one area. Reverting to the analogy of the army, those divisions that watch and wait are just as much co-operating actively as the division that is actually fighting. The only time, whilst the experiment is going on, that individual Civil Disobedience may be resorted to simultaneously, is when the Government obstruct even the silent prosecution of Swadeshi. Thus if an order of prohibition is served upon an expert spinner going to teach or organise spinning, that order should be summarily disregarded and the teacher should court imprisonment. But in all other respects, in so far

as I can judge at present, it will be best for every other part of India scrupulously to respect all orders and instructions, whilst one part is deliberately taking the offensive and committing a deliberate breach of all the unmoral state laws it possibly can. Needless to add that any outbreak of violence in any other part of India must necessarily injure and may even stop the experiment. The other parts will be expected to remain immovable and unperturbed, even though the people within the area of experiment may be imprisoned, riddled with bullets or otherwise ill-treated by the authorities. We must expect them to give a good account of themselves in every conceivable circumstance.

17th November, 1921

CIVIL VERSUS CRIMINAL

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

When a man wilfully breaks his own laws, the disobedience becomes criminal. For he commits the breach not against himself but against some one else, and not only escapes punishment for the breach for there is none provided against himself by the maker of laws, but he avoids also the inconvenience caused by their observance. What is true of the individual is true of the corporation. At the present moment, one observes this criminal breach by the Government of its own laws throughout India. Sections of the Penal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code are being freely abused. And because Non-co-operators refrain from questioning orders issued by officials, bare-faced illegalities are being committed by them with impunity. We have seen this in Bulandshahr, in Chittagong, all over Sindh, and nowhere so syste-

matically and so deliberately as in the Madras Presidency. Mr. Yakub Hassan has pointed out with great justification that his arrest and conviction are contrary to the spirit of the Viceregal pledge. Indeed, it is against not only the spirit of Lord Reading's pledge but it is against the letter even of his predecessor's communique in which it was declared in solemn tones that, so long as Non-co-operation remained non-violent, there would be no repression. No one dare accuse Mr. Yakub Hassan of having incited to violence in his Tanjore address before an audience of picked representatives. Nor was any violence done in the Tanjore district as a result of his speech. The Magistrate in the case of Mr. Iyer of the *Deshabhaktan* actually admitted that there was not a trace of violence in the writing that was impeached and that it actually contained exhortations to Non-violence. Mr. Ramaswami Iyengar, a leading pleader of Coimbatore, has been arrested for a spirited letter to the *Hindu,* though there was no violence in it. And so have Dr. Varadarajulu and Mr. Gopalakrishnayyah been arrested for their speeches and writings, although it is known that they not only do not incite to violence but that theirs is actually a restraining influence in the face of provocation. Is it any wonder if one infers from this campaign of repression an intention on the part of the Government to invite violence? In not one of these cases I have mentioned has there been any outbreak of violence as a result of the speeches and writings concerned. And so we see that the Government is guilty of criminal breach of its own laws. And what legal remedy has the afflicted individual against the Government? There is certainly no sanction provided against the Government in law when it prostitutes the law itself to its own base ends.

When therefore a Government thus becomes lawless in an organised manner, Civil Disobedience becomes a sacred duty and is the only remedy open specially to those who had no hand in the making of the Government or its laws. Another remedy there certainly is, and that is armed revolt. Civil Disobedience is a complete, effective and bloodless substitute. And it is well that by exemplary restraint and discipline in the way of submission to unjust and even illegal orders we have created the necessary atmosphere for Civil Disobedience. For thereby on the one hand the tyrannical nature of the Government has been made more manifest, and on the other by willing obedience we have fitted ourselves for Civil Disobedience.

It is equally as well that Civil Disobedience is being confined even now to the smallest area possible. It must be admitted that it is an abnormal state, even as a corrupt and unpopular Government should be in civilised society, like disease, an abnormal state. Therefore, only when a citizen has disciplined himself in the art of voluntary obedience to the state laws is he justified on rare occasions deliberately but non-violently to disobey them, and expose himself to the penalty of the breach. If then we are to achieve the maximum result in the minimum of time, whilst fiercest disobedience is going on in a limited area, perfect submission to the laws must be yielded in all the other parts so as to test the nation's capacity for voluntary obedience and for understanding the virtue of Civil Disobedience. Any unauthorised outbreak of disobedience, therefore, in any part of India will most certainly damage the cause and will betray an unpardonable ignorance of the principles of Civil Disobedience.

We must expect the Government to take the strictest

measures to suppress this impending defiance of authority, for on it depends its very existence. Its instinct of self-preservation alone will actuate measures of repression adequate for suppression. And if it fails, the Government of necessity disappears. That is, it either bends to the national will or it is dissolved. The greatest danger lies in violence breaking out anywhere by reason of provocation. But it would be wrong and unmanly to invite the sternest measures and then to be incensed against them, apart from the fact that it will be a breach of our solemn pledge of non-violence. I may be arrested, thousands who take part in the peaceful revolt may also be arrested, imprisoned, even tortured. The rest of India must not lose its head. When the proper time comes, the rest of India may respond by undertaking Civil Disobedience and inviting arrests, imprisonments and tortures. It is the sacrifice of the innocent we want to make. That alone will appear pleasing to God. And therefore, on the eve of the great battle the nation is embarking upon, my earnest exhortation to every Non-co-operator is to fit himself for Civil Disobedience by fulfilling to the letter and in the spirit the conditions of Civil Disobedience laid down at Delhi,* and to ensure non-violence everywhere. Let us not be satisfied that we remain non-violent individually. We boast that Non-co-operation has become universal in India. We boast that we have acquired sufficient influence even over the unruly masses to restrain them from violence. Let us prove true to our claim.

* *See* appendix.

8th December, 1921

BARDOLI

I have paid in the company of Maulana Azad Sobhani the much expected visit to Bardoli *taluka*. It has a population of nearly one hundred thousand. It has about 140 villages. It had about sixty five Government schools. Of these fifty one have been nationalised. The Government schools are continued in some cases but have an attendance of less than 10 boys. The national schools have charge of over six thousand children including a few hundred girls. And spinning is compulsory in all these schools, though it is not yet being regularly taught or practised. Most of the schools have been nationalised only during the past three months. In all the villages I found the women taking keen interest in the national movement. We met thousands of people and visited six villages during the two days of our stay. The majority of men were dressed from top to toe in handspun *Khadi* and a large number of women too were so dressed. Those who were not, complained that they could not obtain *Khadi*. This does not however mean that the people, either men or women, have given up the use of their old foreign stock. Many, I am sorry to say, still use it for domestic wear. Much is still left to be done in the shape of manufacture of *Khadi*. There is a good number of wheels but very few looms in the *taluka*. The reader will be pained to hear that its staple crop is cotton which has hitherto been all exported. There is complete harmony between Hindus and Mussalmans. The relations with the co-operators have not been bitter. The untouchables freely attend meetings. I have however suggested that it can hardly be considered satisfactory so long as the managers of national schools do not

go out of their way to bring 'untouchable' children to their schools and villagers do not take a personal interest in the welfare of these suppressed countrymen. Many liquor shops are deserted. From all the accounts received by me, there has been little or no intimidation resorted to in order to achieve this very wonderful result. In two or three cases, volunteers visited villagers, and on the parents hesitating to withdraw their children from Government schools, sat *dhurna* and fasted until the bewildered parents had complied with their request. I told the workers that even this kind of pressure bordered on violence, for we had no right to make people conform to our opinion by fasting. One may conceivably fast for enforcing one's right but not for imposing one's opinion on another.

There was too a social boycott of a liquor dealer who had not kept his promise. I have advised even against such a boycott among a people so helpless as ours. Strong public opinion must for the time being be our only remedy for correcting internal abuses. Social boycott such as stopping barbers, washermen, etc., is undoubtedly a punishment which may be good in a free society but it becomes oppressive in a country which has for years been governed by force.

But I was remarkably struck by the almost completely peaceful manner in which the *taluka* of Bardoli has made a radical change for the better in many departments of life. It was an agreeable surprise, too, to find the movement being handled by elderly men who have never taken part in politics. The reader will be pleasingly astonished to find that all the wonderful work in Bardoli has been done by unpaid volunteers. Bardoli happens to be a *taluka* in which there are few paupers, and most people have easy means of livelihood. This

manifestation of public life is all the more remarkable on that account and is mainly, if not entirely, due to the utterly selfless services of a band of able and enthusiastic workers who only know to do or die. But in spite of all this great work, I was reluctantly obliged to give my verdict in which Maulana Azad Sobhani fully concurred and which was accepted by the noble band of workers, that Bardoli before it challenged the might of a great empire, must complete its Swadeshi programme to the extent of manufacturing sufficient handspun to clothe itself, must freely admit untouchables into the national schools and must be so far non-violent that solitary unarmed co-operators and English and other officials might feel absolutely secure in their midst. And those conditions, God willing, the good people of Bardoli have undertaken to fulfil in a few months' time. An elderly co-operator put down six months at the outside. An enthusiastic young man who knew what he was talking about put down the period at one month. I close this happy recollection of our visit to Bardoli by informing the reader that several co-operators whom I met testified to the peaceful and zealous manner in which the volunteers had worked in this *taluka* which, let us hope, will still have the privilege, if necessary, of giving battle to the Government.

5th January, 1922

THE IMMEDIATE ISSUE

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Swaraj, the Khilafat, the Punjab occupy a subordinate place to the issue sprung upon the country by the Government. We must first make good the right of free

speech and free association before we can make any further progress towards our goal. The Government would kill us if they could by a flank attack. To accept defeat in the matter of free speech and free association is to court disaster. If the Government is allowed to destroy non-violent activities in the country, however dangerous they may be to its existence, even the moderates' work must come to a standstill. In the general interest, therefore, we must defend these elementary rights with our lives. We cannot be coerced into welcoming the Prince nor can we be coerced into disbanding volunteer association or giving up any other activities which we may deem desirable for our growth.

The safest and the quickest way to defend these rights is to ignore the restriction. We must speak the Truth under a shower of bullets. We must band together in the face of bayonets. No cost is too great for purchasing these fundamental rights. And on this there can be no compromise, no parleying, no conference. Withdrawal of notifications of disbandment and prohibition orders and discharge of all who are imprisoned for non-violent activities must precede any conference or settlement. We must be content to die, if we cannot live as free men and women.

I wish I could persuade everybody that Civil Disobedience is the inherent right of a citizen. He dare not give it up without ceasing to be a man. Civil Disobedience is never followed by anarchy. Criminal Disobedience can lead to it. Every state puts down Criminal Disobedience by force. It perishes, if it does not. But to put down Civil Disobedience is to attempt to imprison conscience. Civil Disobedience can only lead to strength and purity. A civil resister never uses arms and, hence, he is harmless to a state that is at all willing to listen to the voice of

public opinion. He is dangerous for an autocratic state, for he brings about its fall by engaging public opinion upon the matter for which he resists the state. Civil Disobedience, therefore, becomes a sacred duty when the state has become lawless, or which is the same thing, corrupt. And a citizen that barters with such a state shares its corruption or lawlessness.

It is, therefore, possible to question the wisdom of applying Civil Disobedience in respect of a particular act or law; it is possible to advise delay and caution. But the right itself cannot be allowed to be questioned. It is a birthright that cannot be surrendered without surrender of one's self-respect.

At the same time that the right of Civil Disobedience is insisted upon, its use must be guarded by all conceivable restrictions. Every possible provision should be made against an outbreak of violence or general lawlessness. Its area as well as its scope should also be limited to the barest necessity of the case. In the present case, therefore, aggressive Civil Disobedience should be confined to a vindication of the right of free speech and free association. In other words, Non-co-operation, so long as it remains non-violent, must be allowed to continue without let or hindrance. When that position is attained, it is time for a representative conference to be summoned for the settlement of Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj, but not till then.

12th January, 1922

LIBERTY OF THE PRESS

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

One by one the pretensions of the Government that

the reforms represent more liberty and more concession to popular feeling are dropping out under the stress of circumstances. The pretensions can be justified, only if they can stand the test under a severe strain. Liberty of speech means that it is unassailed, even when the speech hurts; liberty of the Press can be said to be truly respected only when the Press can comment in the severest terms upon and even misrepresent matters, protection against misrepresentation or violence being secured not by an administrative gagging order, not by closing down the press but by punishing the real offender, leaving the Press itself unrestricted. Freedom of association is truly respected, when assemblies of people can discuss even revolutionary projects, the state relying upon the force of public opinion and the civil police, not the savage military at its disposal, to crush any actual outbreak of revolution that is designed to confound public opinion and the state representing it.

The Government of India is now seeking to crush the three powerful vehicles of expressing and cultivating public opinion and is thus once more, but happily for the last time, proving its totally arbitrary and despotic character. The fight for Swaraj, the Khilafat, the Punjab means a fight for this threefold freedom before all else.

The *Independent* is no longer a printed sheet. The *Democrat* is no more. And now the sword has descended upon the *Pratap* and the *Kesari* of Lahore. The *Bande Mataram*, Lalaji's child, has warded off the blow by depositing Rs. 2,000 security. The other two have had their first security forfeited and are now given ten days' notice to deposit Rs. 10,000 each or close down. I hope that the security of Rs. 10,000 will be refused.

I presume that what is happening in the United

Provinces and the Punjab will happen in the others in due course, unless the infection is prevented from spreading by some action on the part of the public.

In the first place, I would urge the Editors of the papers in question to copy the method of the *Independent* and publish their views in writing. I believe that an Editor who has anything worth saying and who commands a *clientele* cannot be easily hushed so long as his body is left free. He has delivered his finished message as soon as he is put under duress. The Lokamanya spoke more eloquently from the Mandalay fortress than through the columns of the printed *Kesari*. His influence was multiplied a thousandfold by his incarceration and his speech and his pen had acquired much greater power after he was discharged than before his imprisonment. By his death he is editing his paper without pen and speech through the sacred resolution of the people to realise his life's dream. He could not possibly have done more, if he were to-day in the flesh preaching his *Mantra*. Critics like me would perhaps be still finding fault with this expression of his or that. To-day all criticism is hushed and his *Mantra* alone rules millions of hearts which are determined to raise a permanent living memorial by the fulfilment of his *Mantra* in their lives.

Therefore let us first break the idol of machinery and leaden type. The pen is our foundry and the hands of willing copyists our printing machine. Idolatry is permissible in Hinduism when it subserves an ideal. It becomes a sinful fetish when the idol itself becomes the ideal. Let us use the machine and the type, whilst we can, to give unfettered expression to our thoughts. But let us not feel helpless when they are taken away from us by a 'paternal' Government, watching and controlling

every combination of types and every movement of the printing machine.

But the handwritten newspaper is, I admit, a heroic remedy meant for heroic times. By being indifferent to the aid of the printing room and the compositor's stick we ensure their free retention or restoration for all time.

We must do something more. We must apply Civil Disobedience for the restoration of that right before we think of what we call larger things. The restoration of free speech, free association and free Press is almost the whole Swaraj. I would therefore respectfully urge the conference that is meeting on Saturday * next at the instance of Paṇdit Malaviyaji and other distinguished sons of India to concentrate upon the removal of these obstacles on which all can more heartily join than upon the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj. Let us take care of these precious pennies and then the pound will take care of itself.

26th January, 1922

NON-PAYMENT OF TAXES

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The idea of non-payment of taxes is in the air. The Andhras have made us more familiar with the cry than any other part of India. Whilst the Congress has given provincial autonomy to every Province, I have ventured to warn the provinces against embarking upon a non-payment campaign till I had tried the experiment myself in some area under my own supervision.† I

* *See* p. 921.

†The following appeared in *Young India* of 19th January, 1921:

I observe a desire in some places to precipitate mass Civil Disobedience by suspending payment of taxes. But I would urge the

abide by that warning. I must also draw attention to the fact that we are not to start offensive Civil Disobedience till the 31st instant, or if it is sooner, till the Malaviya Conference Committee knows the result of its negotiations and knows that the proposed round-table conference is not to come off. Therefore any suspension of taxes at the present moment can only be regarded as temporary holding back, pending the result of the negotiations carried on by that Committee. But 31st January will be soon upon us. And it is necessary to consider the question of non-payment of taxes in all its bearings.

On this subject, a friend who is in deep sympathy with the national movement, and who is a fairly accurate student of it, thus expresses his apprehensions:

"I have often thought to what extent the non-violent Non-co-operation movement transgresses the religious limits, when it embarks on Civil Disobedience in the

---

greatest caution before embarking upon the dangerous adventure. We must not be indifferent about violence, and we must make sure of masses exercising self-control whilst they are witnesses to the confiscation of their crops and cattle or forfeiture of their holdings. I know that withholding of payment of taxes is one of the quickest methods of overthrowing a government. I am equally sure that we have not yet evolved that degree of strength and discipline which are necessary for conducting a successful campaign of non-payment of taxes. Not a single *tehsil* in India is yet ready, except perhaps Bardoli and to a lesser degree Anand. More than fifty per cent. of the population of such *tehsil* has to rid itself of the curse of untouchability, must be dressed in *Khadi* manufactured in the *tehsil*, must be Non-violent in thought, word and deed, and must be living in perfect friendliness with all, whether co-operators or Non-co-operators. Non-payment of taxes without the necessary discipline will be an act of unpardonable madness. Instead of leading to Swaraj, it is likely to lead to no-Raj. I must therefore repeat the caution I have so often uttered that mass civil disobedience ought not to be tried in the first instance, except under my personal supervision, and certainly never without the fulfilment of the conditions laid down at Delhi.

form of non-payment of taxes. I look upon the non-violent Non-co-operation as essentially a spiritual movement. I know Mr. Gandhi does not think it otherwise. Will not the programme of the non-payment of taxes transgress the religious limit and lead to violence and bring into the movement people who are not as yet saturated with the principle of non-violence? Is not Mr. Gandhi holding out, however unconsciously, a material bait for his spiritual movement by which he means to conquer the Government? Recent events have shown that the temper of violence and the belief in violence are not eliminated from our character in the masses. And, therefore, it would be a leap in the dark fraught with disastrous consequences to carry out the programme of Civil Disobedience in the form of non-payment of taxes. I am therefore most anxious that Mr. Gandhi should not begin Civil Disobedience in this form as yet."

The validity of the objection lies in the statement that the non-payment campaign will bring into the movement people who are not as yet saturated with the principle of non-violence. This is very true, and because it is true, non-payment does 'hold out a material bait'. It follows, therefore, we must not resort to non-payment because of the possibility of a ready response. The readiness is a fatal temptation. Such non-payment will not be civil or non-violent, but it will be criminal or fraught with the greatest possibility of violence. Let us remember the experience of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru when the peasants, after they had taken the pledge of non-violence, told him that if he advised them to do violence, they would be certainly ready to do so. Not until the peasantry is trained to understand the reason and the virtue of *civil* non-payment and is prepared to look with calm resignation upon the confiscation (which can only be temporary)

of their holdings and the forced sale of their cattle and other belongings, may they be advised to withold payment of taxes. They must be told what happened in holy Palestine. Arabs who were fined were surrounded by soldiers. Aeroplanes were hovering over head. And the sturdy men were dispossessed of their cattle. The latter were impounded and left without fodder and even water. When the Arabs, stupefied and rendered helpless, brought the fine and additional penalty, as if to mock them, they had their dead and dying cattle returned to them. Worse things can and certainly will happen in India. Are the Indian peasantry prepared to remain absolutely non-violent, and see their cattle taken away from them to die of hunger and thirst? I know that such things have already happened in Andhra Desh. If the peasantry in general knowingly and deliberately remain peaceful even in such trying circumstances, they are nearly ready for non-payment.

I say 'nearly ready,' for non-payment is intended to transfer the power from the bureaucracy into our hands. It is therefore not enough that the peasantry remain non-violent. Non-violence is certainly nine-tenths of the battle, but it is not all. The peasantry may remain non-violent, but may not treat the untouchables as their brethren; they may not regard Hindus, Mussalmans, Christians, Jews, Parsis, as the case may be, their brethren; they may not have learnt the economic and the moral value of the *charkha* and the *khaddar*. If they have not, they cannot gain Swaraj. They will not do all these things after Swaraj, if they will not do them now. They must be taught to know that the practice of these national virtues means Swaraj.

Thus civil non-payment of taxes is a privilege capable of being exercised only after rigorous training. And

even as *Civil* Disobedience is difficult in the case of a habitual offender against the laws of the state, so is *civil* non-payment difficult for those who have hitherto been in the habit of withholding payment of taxes on the slightest pretext. Civil non-payment of taxes is indeed the last stage in Non-co-operation. We must not resort to it, till we have tried the other forms of Civil Disobedience. And it will be the height of unwisdom to experiment with non-payment in large or many areas in the beginning stages.

I hear the talk even of refusing payment of rent to Zamindars. It must not be forgotten that we are not Non-co-operating with Zamindars, whether Indian or foreign. We are engaged in a fight with one big Zamindar—the bureaucracy—which has made of us and the Zamindars themselves serfs. We must try to bring round the Zamindars to our side, and isolate the big Zamindar. But if they will not come to us, we must be patient with them. We may not even proclaim a social boycott against them. That is to say, we may not refuse social service such as dhobie, barber, etc. to them. In areas under permanent settlement therefore, there can be no non-payment campaign except in respect of cesses that might be payable directly to the Government. But the mention of Zamindars merely shows the difficulties that beset us in the pursuit of no-tax campaign. All things considered, therefore, it is my deliberate opinion that the no-tax movement for the objects of the Congress should be, for the time being, left to me; meanwhile workers can develop their own districts along constructive lines. They can discover various other methods of offering mass Civil Disobedience, and then, as the people become purified and enlightened, lead them on to non-payment.

As for the Andhras where preparations on an intensive scale have already been made, I do not wish to damp the ardour of the workers. If they are satisfied that the people in the selected areas fulfil all the tests laid down at Delhi,* and that they are capable of endless suffering without retaliation, I have nothing to say but to pronounce 'God bless the brave Andhras.' They must know that the responsibility will be entirely theirs for any mishap that may occur. They will not be blamed by anybody, if they do not take up the no-tax movement.

26th January, 1922

POLES ASUNDER

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The debate in the Assembly and the Council of State affords the clearest possible justification for my distrust of the Government and, therefore, any round table conference at the present moment. The Government supporters consider the Congress demands to be impossible and repression to be the only way possible to put down Non-co-operation. If I believed the Congress demands to be impossible and the use of force to be justifiable for putting down the pursuit of impossible ideals, I should also vote with the Government. I have, therefore, no difficulty about understanding and even appreciating the attitude of the Government and its supporters.

But I oppose the Government and thoroughly distrust it, because I so thoroughly understand its attitude. India can never attain freedom by going along the route the Government will take her.

Let us see.

**See* appendix.

Why is the Khilafat demand impossible? All that the Congress asks in effect is that the Government of India and the Imperial Government, if they wish to retain the people's co-operation, should work with them in getting the demands fulfiled. They should, therefore, perform that part of the obligation which rests with them, and vigorously prosecute the rest as if it was their own grievance. What will the Imperial Government do if France were to attempt to deprive England of Dover, and India were secretly to help France or openly to show indifference or hostility to England's struggle to retain Dover? Can Indians be expected to sit idle when the Khilafat is vivisected?

What is impossible about the Punjab demand? Why do they talk about the legalities of the case? If they will take care of the moralities, legalities will take care of themselves. As a boy I learnt a legal maxim that where there is a conflict between Law and Equity, the latter should prevail. It is not with me a copy book maxim. But I am told it is immoral to ask for the deprivation of a pension, which is but deferred pay. Why has Sardar Gauharsingh been deprived of his "deferred pay" and why are the other pensioners threatened if they should take part in the present agitation? Does a servant who vilifies his employer receive pay or pension? Have Sir Michael O'Dwyer or General Dyer ever admitted their 'error of judgment'? Why should the children of the murdered men of Jallianwalla Bagh, or the men who were brutally flogged or made to crawl, although they had done no wrong, pay those who were responsible for these barbarities? I do not know a single principle of ethics, save that of might, that can justify the continuation of pensions to servants who are unrepentant. The viewpoints of the two parties are so different that what

appears to be just and moral to the one, appears unjust and immoral to the other. I venture to claim that in asking for the stoppage of pensions, the Congress is just, without being vindictive. It waives penalties. It merely refuses still further to participate in the wrong by continuing to give pensions. The truth is that the Government still considers the two offenders to be distinguished servants of the Crown. *That* attitude has to be changed before a repetition of the Punjab becomes impossible.

As with the Punjab so with Swaraj. It appears to the Government impossible to return to India what is hers. Reforms by instalments is the motto. The underlying idea is not to give anything, unless it is absolutely necessary. The differences are so great that I dread to think of Swaraj before the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs are put away. They seem so simple in the statement. But they are as difficult as Swaraj, because their redress means obedience to India's will.

This is all cold logic. There is nothing impossible about the demands. The impossibility consists in the unwillingness of the power-holders to part with the power that should never have been theirs.

Why should there be repression at all, if only the Government will do their duty? Assume that violence is a certainty if mass Civil Disobedience is precipitated. Are the people to be baulked of their rights for fear of violence? It does not strike the co-operators that they uphold injustice and add insult to it, when they accuse civil resisters of precipitating a crisis. The Government are deliberately inviting a crisis. They are precipitating violence by removing every one who has any influence over the people and who can keep them non-violent. Co-operators do not see that the action of the Government is like that of a man, who refuses to give food to a

hungry man and then threatens to shoot him whilst he is attempting to help himself.

In the midst of an enervating atmosphere such as ours, the duty before Non-co-operators is clear. They must keep exemplary patience. They must not be goaded into precipitate action. They must refuse battle where they are not ready. It is no business of the Government to keep us Non-violent or to help us to remain so. Even their method of restraining violence is exasperatingly violent. In one respect, however, we must feel thankful to them, for their protest and criticism amount to nothing but this, that we do not know how to practise our creed and that we are incompetent to inflict successful violence, even if we would. Let us admit both these arguments. We must be true to our creed. Then it is common cause that the Government must lay down arms. And let those who do not believe in the creed at least see that *India is neither ready nor willing to meet violence with violence.* I wish those who believe in the necessity of violence for India's freedom will realise the truth of my position. They must not think that because *they* are ready and willing to do violence, India is likewise ready or willing. I claim that India is unready, *not* because she is helpless *but* because she is unwilling. Therefore Non-violence is unexpectedly succeeding, whereas violence, in spite of the vaunted talk of human nature, would have failed. India's past training for ages, I mean the training of the masses, has been against violence. Human nature in India has advanced so far that the doctrine of Non-violence is more natural for the people at large than that of violence. Let us also remember that the experiences of Bombay and Madras prove my proposition. If the people of India were violent by nature, there was enough in Bombay and

Madras to give rise to an unquenchable conflagration. A little violence like dirt is enough to disturb or soil a peaceful or clean surface, but either being a foreign addition is soon removed. To train India for violence and thus to wrest Swaraj by violence is a work of ages. I verily believe that this wonderful manifestation of energy and national consciousness is purely and simply due to the advent of Non-violence. People have come to their own. Let no hasty action arrest its progress.

26th January, 1922

AN ENGLISH LADY BLESSES

'An English lady' who sends her name and address writing from Calcutta says:

> "It elevates one to see the admirable way in which Mr. Gandhi shows us the truth and opens our eyes to the atrocious things that our so-called noble Government are doing daily. The letter that an 'English missionary' * has written is admirable. I am afraid, there are many more like her, but are too proud to come forward and acknowledge the noble work that Mr. Gandhi is doing. His patience and work are like the spring that lies hidden far below. No matter what the world may preach, God will give him a harvest greater than he expects. It is only those who work in silence reap the harvest. Millions are watching and judging him. But there is One above all, watching and judging each struggle in his daily life, and when his toil and struggle are over, his work and name will live for ever. His name will be worshipped by millions who have gained freedom by his hard work. God bless and spare him and his dear wife, and give them both health and strength to go on until this struggle is over, which will not be long."

It is not without hesitation that I share this letter with the reader. Although written impersonally, it is so personal. But I hope there is no pride in me. I feel I

* Omitted in this collection.

recognise fully *my* weakness. But my faith in God and His strength and love is unshakable. I am like clay in the Potter's hands. And so in the language of the *Gita*, the compliments are laid at His feet. The blessings such as these, I confess, are strength-giving. But my reason for publishing this letter is to encourage every true Non-co-operator in the non-violent path he is pursuing, and to wean the false ones from their error. This is a terribly true struggle. It is *not* based on hate though men of hate are in it. It is a struggle which is based on love, pure and undefiled. If I felt any hate towards Englishmen or those who in their blindness are associated with the blind administrators, I have the courage to retire from the struggle. A man who has the least faith in God and His mercy, which is his justice, cannot hate men, though, at the same time, he must hate their evil ways. But having abundant evil in himself and ever standing in need of charity, he must not hate those in whom he sees evil. This struggle, therefore, is intended to make friends with Englishmen, and the whole world. It cannot be by false flattery but, by plainly telling Englishmen of India that their ways are evil and that we will not co-operate with them so long as they retain them. If we are wrong in so thinking, God will forgive us, for we mean no ill to them and we are prepared to suffer at their hands. If we are right, as sure as I am writing this, our suffering will open their eyes even as it has opened those of 'an English lady.' Nor is she the only one. I meet Englishmen during my travels. I do not know them, but they greet me cordially and wish me success and pass on. True, as against scores who thus bless me, there are hundreds that curse me. These curses also I am bidden to lay at His feet. They come from ignorance. Many Englishmen and even some Indians consider me and my

activity to be mischievous. Non-co-operators must tolerate even these. If they get angry and retaliate, they lose the battle, whereas if they suffer, they win without fail and without delay. *The whole of the delay is due, I am convinced, to our shortcomings.* We have not been always non-violent. We have, contrary to our pledge, laboured ill-will. Our opponents, the English administrators, their co-operators, the Talukdars, the Rajahs, have distrusted us and have felt afraid of us. We are bound by our pledge to clothe them with the fullest protection. Whilst we may not help them in the exploitation of the poor and the weak, we must not harm them. Though they are in a hopeless minority, they must be made to feel safer in our midst than they are behind the bayonets. If we were in a hopeless minority, ours would be an easier position—we would long ago have proved our faith. As it is, our numbers embarass us. The dissatisfaction with the present regime is common to us; but not the burning faith in non-violence. We must not be satisfied till we have rendered impossible the disgraceful scenes that took place in Madras.* We must not, with non-violence on our lips, obstruct court proceedings. Either we seek imprisonment, or we do not. If we do, we must let the Government take us away as fast as they wish. The struggle is prolonged to the extent that we fail to understand the implications of non-violence.

* When [the Prince arrived in Madras, there was a hartal, but there was some coercion in some parts of the city.

26th January, 1922

FRAUGHT WITH DANGER

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

"Jhajjar is a tehsil town in the Rohtak district with a population of about 11,000. It has got a Municipality with 4 nominated and 8 elected members. The president is elected. Yet the Municipality was not sympathetic towards popular activities. Therefore the local Congress workers, rightly or wrongly, issued a notice upon the Municipality without any permission from the District Congress Committee, that if it did not make itself popular within 15th to 22nd January, the Congress Committee will take possession of the Town Hall. The Municipality ignored this notice altogether. On the other hand, the local leading worker, Pandit Sriram, was charged under section 107, and sent to prison for a year by the D. C. on the 15th January, the first day of the allotted period. The Pandit unveiled a portrait of the Lokamanya in the Town Hall on that day, for which the D. C. had given previous permission upon an application from the Municipality. After Pandit Sriram's imprisonment, the President of the local Congress Committee and the volunteers took possession of the Town Hall on the 16th. A regular guard of volunteers was set up. The volunteers' took possession also of the four gates of the town and disturbed the octroi arrangement. As soon as this news reached Rohtak, I started for Ghajjar, for Lala Shyamlal was not present there, having gone to Ferozepnr-Jhirka to attend a Congress Committee meeting. The people are even bent on violence. I advised them at night to remain non-violent, which produced some effect. But an influential preacher of Non-violence is necessary to convert them. On the 18th night at 8 p.m., some respectable citizens of the town called together Congress workers and Municipal Commissioners and tried to settle the matter amicably. All the elected members excepting the President, who was absent, and two nominated members of the Municipality, agreed to resign. And it was decided also that the Town Hall would be under the control of the Congress Committee. However, the matter will be finally settled at noon to-day. The volunteers are still guarding the premises. The people have proclaimed by *Panchayeti* a social boycott of the six witnesses who stood against Pt. Sriram, *viz.*, the Tahsildar,

Thandar, Lambardar, and the President, Vice-President and Secretary of the Municipal Committee. The Town Hall was erected with public subscription in memory of the late Queen Victoria. For some 5 or 6 years it remained uncared for, but now for the last ten years or so the Municipality has taken charge of the building. If the settlement arrived at the conference of the 18th night is not observed, popular excitement will grow which may, I fear, ultimately lead to violence. The local leaders and volunteers are unbending. I am writing this at 10 a.m. on the 19th. Please guide us as to what to do by wire or by letter to the address at Rohtak."

Thus writes (the original is in Hindi) Lala Daulatram Gupta, acting President of Rohtak District Congress Committee. The action of the Congress workers in Jhajjar is audacious and inspiring. But it is fraught with the greatest danger. It has reached the border line of violence and indiscipline. I can fully appreciate the noble desire of the people to possess their own property. Municipalities are perhaps the greatest fraud palmed off upon India. The Government has hitherto used them for consolidating its power. But where the citizens are united, they can attain the municipal home-rule in a moment. I have not yet described the quiet, orderly and evolutionary revolution that is going on in three big municipalities in the Bombay Presidency, *viz.*, Ahmedabad, Surat and Nadiad.* Of that, some other time. It is not as yet a completed picture. But Jhajjar will outpace the three municipalities, if it remains steady and absolutely non-violent. Possession of the Town Hall can be retained without any ado, if the citizens of the place are unanimous. It cannot be retained, if there is real opposition. Any outbreak of popular violence will be a crime of the first magnitude, because it would be wanton and unprovoked. India, in the language of Maulana Abdul Kalam, is

**See* page 769.

the greatest Gurdwara; it is the largest Town Hall. And if we have not yet succeeded in possessing it, we may wait for the occupation of the Town Hall of Jhajjar. The Congress officers *must* surrender it, (1) if there is the slightest fear of violence, (2) if the elected members oppose the act of occupation, (3) if the Committee at Rohtak, or failing that, the Committee at Lahore vetoes the occupation, (4) if the Police demand it at the point of the bayonet, unless the occupiers are prepared to die at their post without retaliation or resentment, and if the other citizens are certain not to get excited, impatient and violent.

The occupation appears to me to be a hasty act, but if it can be defended non-violently, the defect can be cured.

There is no harm in surrender. We shall gain strength by retracing every false or hasty step. What may have been taken wrongly, must be given up, and can be retaken by methodical work. In the case of Jhajjar, if the Town Hall has to be surrendered, it can be retaken by the elected members, who are in a majority, passing a resolution giving the use to the Congress Committee. If the elected members will not do so, the electors may, by a requisition, call upon the elected members to give effect to their views.

Social boycott of the witnesses who gave evidence against Pandit Sri Ram is clearly a mistake and will defeat its own end. We must not resort to social boycott of our opponents. It amounts to coercion. Claiming the right of free opinion and free action as we do, we must extend the same to others. The rule of majority, when it becomes coercive, is as intolerable as that of a bureaucratic minority. We must patiently try to bring round the minority to our view by gentle persuasion and

argument. Having been trained only to do things by order and under fear of punishment, we are likely, in the consciousness of strength we are daily acquiring, to repeat the mistakes of the rulers in an exaggerated form in our relations with those who may happen to be weaker than we are. That will be a worse state than the first.

I am aware that, by discussing Lala Daulatram Gupta's letter publicly, I am exposing the actors in the little drama in Jhajjar to misrepresentation and risk. The authorities can easily distort and exaggerate the facts related, as they are often prone to do. But as the matter is of great importance, and as the workers have exposed themselves to greater risks than I can possibly expose them to, I have felt it my duty publicly to discuss the pros and cons of the act of occupation which, though fraught with danger, commands one's admiration for its bravery. Non-co-operators have burnt their boats. They have no secrets. But correspondents who wish to write in confidence are welcome to do so. I shall respect their confidence. But as all my work is done in open daylight, and as my post passes through the hands of many helpers, I would like to discountenance confidential correspondence as much as possible. Though the Government, be it said to their credit, have generally not tampered with my correspondence, the correspondents must also note that, like all correspondence, mine is equally at their mercy.

2nd February, 1922

BARDOLI'S DECISION

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

Bardoli has come to a momentous decision. It has

made its final and irrevocable choice. Vithalbhai Patel, the President, addressed a conference of the representatives of the Taluka in a speech impressive for its warning. He certainly did not mince matters. There was an audience of *khaddar* clad representatives numbering 4,000. There were five hundred women, a large majority of whom were also in *khaddar*. They were interested and interesting listeners. It was an audience of sober, responsible men and women with a stake.

I followed Vithalbhai and went through every one of the conditions of mass Civil Disobedience laid down by the Congress.* I took the sense of the meeting on every one of the conditions separately. They understood the implications of Hindu-Muslim-Parsi-Christian unity. They realised the significance and the truth of non-violence. They saw what the removal of untouchability meant; they were prepared, not merely to take into National Schools, but to induce 'untouchable' children to join them; they have had no objection to the 'untouchable' drawing water from the village wells. They knew that they were to nurse the 'untouchable' sick as they would nurse their ailing neighbours. They knew that they could not exercise the privilege of non-payment of revenue and other forms of Civil Disobedience until they had purified themselves in the manner described by me. They knew too, that they had to become industrious and spin their own yarn and weave their own *khaddar*. And lastly, they were ready to face forfeiture of their movables, their cattle and their land. They were ready to face imprisonment and even death, if necessary, and they would do all this without resentment.

There was an old dissentient voice on the question of

*The conditions laid down by the All-India Congress Committee at its Delhi meeting on 4th November, 1921. *See* appendix.

untouchability. He said, what I said was right in theory, but it was difficult in practice to break down the custom all of a sudden. I drove the point home that the audience had made up its mind.

Before the larger meeting, I had met the real workers about fifty in number. Before that meeting, Vithalbhai Patel, some workers and I conferred together and felt that we would pass a resolution postponing the decision for about a fortnight, to make the Swadeshi preparation more complete and removal of untouchability more certain, by actually having untouchable children in all the sixty National Schools. The brave and earnest workers of Bardoli will not listen to the postponement. They were certain that more than 50 per cent. of the Hindu population were quite ready about untouchability and they were sure of being able to manufacture enough *khaddar* for their future wants. They were bent on trying conclusions with the Government. They bore down every objection raised by Vithalbhai Patel, and Abbas Tyabji, with his hoary beard and ever smiling face, was there to utter the warning. But they would not budge an inch from their position and so the resolution which I give below was unanimoulsy passed:

"After having fully understood and considered the conditions as essential for the starting of mass Civil Disobedience, this Conference of the inhabitants of the Bardoli Taluka resolves that this Taluka is fit for mass Civil Disobedience.

This Conference is of opinion:

(*a*) That for the redress of India's grievances, unity among Hindus, Mahomedans, Parsis, Christians and other communities of India is absolutely necessary.

(*b*) That non-violence, patience and endurance are the only remedy for the redress of the said grievances.

(*c*) That the use of the spinning wheel in every home, and the adoption of hand-spun and hand-woven garments to the exclusion of all other cloth by every individual are indispensable for India's freedom.

(*d*) That Swaraj is impossible without complete removal of untouchability by the Hindus.

(*e*) That for the people's progress and for the attainment of freedom, readiness to sacrifice movable and immovable property, to suffer imprisonment and, if necessary, to lay down one's life is indispensable.

"This Conference hopes that the Bardoli Taluka will have the privilege to be the first for the aforesaid sacrifices, and this Conference hereby respectfully informs the Working Committee that unless the Working Committee otherwise decides or unless the proposed Round Table Conference is held, this Taluka will immediately commence mass Civil Disobedience under the advice and guidance of Mr. Gandhi and the President of Conference.

"This Conference recommends that those tax-payers of the Taluka who are ready and willing to abide by the conditions laid down by the Congress for mass Civil Disobedience, will refrain, till further instruction, from paying land revenue and other taxes due to the Government".

Who knows the issue? Who knows whether the men and women of Bardoli will stand the repression that the Government may resort to? God only knows. In His name has the battle been undertaken. He must finish it.

The Government have acted hitherto in a most exemplary manner. They might have prohibited the Conference. They did not. They know the workers. They could have removed them long ago. They have not done so. They have not interfered with any of the

activities of the people. They have permitted them to make all preparations. I have watched their conduct with wonder and admiration. Both sides have up to the time of writing behaved in a manner worthy of chivalrous warriors of old. In this battle of peace, it ought not to be otherwise. If the battle continues in this fashion, it will end only in one way. Whoever has the ear of 85,000 men and women of Bardoli will gain the day.

The Working Committee has to sit and pass its judgment upon Bardoli's decision. The Viceroy has still choice and will have yet another choice given to him. No charge of hurry, want of preparation or thought, no charge of discourtesy will it be possible to bring against the people of Bardoli.

Therefore,
Lead kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom,
Lead Thou me on;
The night is dark, and I am far from home;
Lead Thou me on.

9th February, 1922

MR. GANDHI'S LETTER TO THE VICEROY

To

HIS EXCELLENCY,
The Viceroy, Delhi.

Sir,—Bardoli is a small *tehsil* in the Surat District in the Bombay Presidency, having a population of about 87,000 all told.

On the 29th ultimo, it decided under the presidency of Mr. Vithalbhai Patel to embark on mass Civil Disobedience, having proved its fitness for it in terms of the resolution of the All-India Congress Committee which

met at Delhi during the first week of November last. But as I am perhaps chiefly responsible for Bardoli's decision, I owe it to Your Excellency and the public to explain the situation under which the decision has been taken.

It was intended under the resolution of the All-India Congress Committee, before referred to, to make Bardoli the first unit for mass Civil Disobedience in order to mark the national revolt against the Government for its consistently criminal refusal to appreciate India's resolve regarding the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj.

Then followed the unfortunate and regrettable rioting on the 17th November last in Bombay, resulting in the postponement of the step contemplated by Bardoli.

Meanwhile, repression of a virulent type has taken place, with the concurrence of the Government of India, in Bengal, Assam, the United Provinces, the Punjab, the Province of Delhi and in a way in Bihar and Orissa and elsewhere. I know that you have objected to the use of the word "repression" for describing the action of the authorities in these provinces. In my opinion, when action is taken which is in excess of the requirements of a situation, it is undoubtedly repression. The looting of property, assaults on innocent people, the brutal treatment of prisoners in the jails including flogging can in no sense be described as legal, civilized or in any way necessary. This official lawlessness cannot be described by any other term but lawless repression. Intimidation by Non-co-operators or their sympathisers to a certain extent in connection with *hartals* and picketing may be admitted but in no case can it be held to justify the wholesale suppression of peaceful volunteering or equally peaceful public meetings under a distorted use of an extraordinary law which was passed in order to deal

with activities which were manifestly violent both in intention and action, nor is it possible to designate as otherwise than repression, action taken against innocent people under what has appeared to many of us an illegal use of the ordinary law, nor again can the administrative interference with the liberty of the press under a law that is under promise of repeal be regarded as anything but repression.

The immediate task before the country, therefore, is to rescue from paralysis freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of the press. In the present mood of the Government of India and in the present unprepared state of the country in respect of complete control of the forces of violence, Non-co-operators were unwilling to have anything to do with the Malaviya Conference' whose object was to induce Your Excellency to convene a Round Table Conference. But as I was anxious to avoid all avoidable suffering, I had no hesitation in advising the Working Committee of the Congress to accept the recommendations of that Conference. Although in my opinion the terms were quite in keeping with your own requirements as I understood them through your Calcutta speech and otherwise, you have summarily rejected the proposal.

In the circumstances, there is nothing before the country but to adopt some non-violent method for the enforcement of its demands including the elementary rights of free speech, free association and free press. In my humble opinion, the recent events are a clear departure from the civilized policy laid down by Your Excellency at the time of the generous, manly and unconditional apology of the Ali Brothers, *viz.*, that the Government of India should not interfere with the activities of Non-co-operators so long as they remained non-violent

in word and deed. Had the Government's policy remained neutral and allowed public opinion to ripen and have its full effect, it would have been possible to advise postponement of the adoption of Civil Disobedience of an aggressive type till the Congress had acquired fuller control over the forces of violence in the country and enforced greater discipline among the millions of its adherents. But this lawless repression (in a way unparalleled in the history of this unfortunate country) has made the immediate adoption of mass Civil Disobedience an imperative duty. The Working Committee of the Congress has restricted it to only certain areas to be selected by me from time to time, and at present it is confined only to Bardoli. I may, under said authority, give my consent at once in respect of a group of 100 villages in Guntur in the Madras Presidency, provided they can strictly conform to the conditions of non-violence, unity among different classes, the adoption and manufacture of handspun *khadi* and untouchability.

But before the people of Bardoli actually commence mass Civil Disobedience, I would respectfully urge you as the head of the Government of India finally to revise your policy and set free all the Non-co-operating prisoners who are convicted or under trial for non-violent activities and to declare in clear terms a policy of absolute non-interference with all non-violent activities in the country, whether they be regarding the redress of the Khilafat or the Punjab wrongs or Swaraj or any other purpose and even though they fall under the repressive sections of the Penal Code or the Criminal Procedure Code or other repressive laws subject always to the condition of non-violence. I would further urge you to free the Press from all administrative control and to restore all the fines and forfeitures recently imposed. In thus urging, I

am asking Your Excellency to do what is being done to-day in every country which is deemed to be under civilized Government. If you can see your way to make the necessary declaration within seven days of the date of publication of this manifesto, I shall be prepared to advise postponement of Civil Disobedience of an aggressive character, till the imprisoned workers have, after their discharge, reviewed the whole situation and considered the position *de novo*. If the Government make the requested declaration, I shall regard it as an honest desire on its part to give effect to public opinion and shall therefore have no hesitation in advising the country to be engaged in further moulding public opinion without violent restraint from either side and trust to its working to secure the fulfilment of its unalterable demands. Aggressive Civil Disobedience in that case will be taken up only when the Government departs from its policy of strictest neutrality or refuses to yield to clearly expressed opinion of the vast majority of the people of India.

I remain,
Your Excellency's faithful
servant and friend,
M. K. GANDHI.

9th February, 1922

THE ONLY ISSUE

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

It was not without deep thought and prayer that I wrote the letter to His Excellency the Viceroy.* It is not a threat because every word in it is meant. It is a

* Given above.

heartfelt prayer to the tyrant to desist from evil. Lord Reading is not the tyrant. The system of which he is himself an unconscious and helpless victim is the tyrant. But every system becomes embodied in a person. To-day it is personified in Lord Reading, no matter how unconscious he is of it. I have invited him in all humility seriously to consider the position and ask himself whether the official lawlessness can in any case be justified. Let him turn to the week's summary to which the old heading "In Cold Blood"* is restored. It is all true if the witnesses are not all liars. Should these things be?

But what of defiance of authority? Must defiance (non-violent at least) indeed of authority be met by barbarous and wicked abuse of it?

If the Viceroy cannot or will not see such an incredibly simple issue, must India sit still? Defensive Civil Disobedience *must* continue at any cost. If the whole of India were to say that even peaceful public meetings may not be held without permission, that peaceful volunteer associations may not be formed without permission and that newspapers cannot be published without permission, that prohibition cannot be accepted. For a man may not be expected to ask for another's leave to breathe or eat or drink. The three things I have mentioned are the breath, the food and the drink of public life.†

* Omitted in this collection. For the nature of the contents thereof, *see* appendix under Repression.

† For the Government of India's reply and the Mahatmaji's comments thereon, *See* appendix.

2nd February, 1922

AWAKENING IN ANDHRADESHA

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

To the date of writing, the following two telegrams have been received at the "Young India" office from the Secretary of the Provincial Congress Committee:

(I) "The Andhra Provincial Congress Working Committee met yesterday at Guntur in Desabhakta's house. Messrs. Bhogaraju, Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Tanguturu Prakasam, Dhanmayya, Ramchandra Rao, Kasindhuni Nageswarrao, Dandu Narayanrao, Deshbhakta Konda Venkatappayya and others were present. Several ryots from different parts of the District, including Pedanandipadu, also attended the meeting and made representations of the conditions prevailing in their places. A graphic description was given how many male adults, including very aged men, enlisted themselves as volunteers in each one of the 50 villages in the neighbourhood of Pedanandipadu and how every one fully clad in *khaddar* has been serving and observing strict non-violence in spite of provocation sometimes given by the military drafted there, the attachments of movables and high-handed removal of carts and bulls even without a show of restraint. They have also stated that in almost all villages all the village officers including the *vettians* have resigned their appointments. Accounts of resignations of village officers in other areas also were given. The Working Committee after prolonged deliberation as a measure of special caution adopted the following resolution:

"This Committee is of opinion that the Guntur District Congress Committee should, instead of carrying on the campaign of non-payment of taxes in several talukas

simultaneously as previously resolved by them, limit the area and appoint a Committee to investigate as to how far the Delhi conditions are satisfied in the said area and resolve on the question of final refusal of taxes in accordance with the opinion of the said Committee."

(2) "Guntur Congress Committee met day before yesterday in the house of Deshabhakta at 1 p. m. for the purpose of considering, amongst other things, the resolution of the Working Committee of the Provincial Congress of the 25th on the question of non-payment of taxes. Mr. Anche Siviah, a leading ryot, and President, District Congress Committee, presided. Mr. Prakasam who came here for the Working Committee meeting of the Provincial Congress Committee was also present. In response to a requisition made to them, leading ryots from different Talukas in the District and some Congress workers also attended the meeting. Having been invited to explain the situation in their respective *talukas* and *fircas*, representative ryots gave accounts of the progress of the movement among the people. Most of them showed their determination to cary on the campaign in spite of all difficulties, while some expressed that some of the conditions of the Delhi resolution had not been fully satisfied in the *fircas* to which they belonged, and that there was need for further preparation in the matter of untouchability, and in one or two even in respect of non-violence. Mr. Prakasam addressed the meeting dealing at some length on the responsibility of the step taken up by the people of the District. He quoted and explained the letter of Mahatmaji regarding non-payment of taxes published in the *Bombay Chronicle* of the 26th. Mr. Venkatappaiah stated that the necessity for conveying this arose out of the letter

addressed to him by Mahatmaji and subsequent correspondence with him. Delhi resolution referred to areas where intensive preparations had been made. Amongst these that spoke on the occasion was Mr. Patri Anantharow of Atulur, who, in view of his imminent arrest by the police, came to the meeting, gave an account of the readiness of the people of his village and areas he had visited, and urged upon the necessity of continuing the movement undeterred, and left the meeting saying that he would be arrested forthwith. Hardly had he passed a few paces from the meeting when he was arrested and taken away by the police. Notwithstanding this incident, the meeting continued till 8 p.m. when it was adjourned to yesterday, not one amongst the audience getting out of the meeting. The members of the District Congress Committee reassembled in the house of Deshabhakta yesterday morning at 8 a.m. and after prolonged discussion the following resolutions were adopted:

(1) In view of the resolution of the Working Committee of the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee dated the 25th, this meeting appoints the gentlemen named below, as a special committee to enquire in the different areas of Guntur District as to how far conditions of Delhi Resolution have been satisfied and how far they have qualified themselves for Civil Disobedience by way of non-payment of taxes, and send up their report to the District Congress Committee by the 10th February. This committee further resolves that, soon after the receipt of the report above mentioned, it be placed before the meeting of the District Congress Committee and a final resolution be adopted on the question of non-payment of taxes and until then the people in the areas specified in the resolution passed at Ponur do continue the suspension of non-payment of taxes.

Members of the Special Committee are Sjt T. Prakasam, Dandu Narain Rau, and K. Nageshwar Rao.

(2) This meeting tenders its hearty congratulations to all patriots who have been sent to jail from this District since the meeting at Ponur. This meeting expresses its grateful appreciation of the resignations by village officers in different parts of the District, and urges upon other village officers also the necessity of giving up their offices and helping the great national movement.

The following is the Associated Press Message about Government preparations :

In regard to the state of affairs in Guntur where Civil Disobedience and non-payment of taxes campaign and resignation of village officers are in operation, Madras Government propose to undertake emergency legislation in direction of amending Madras Revenue Recovery Act (2 of 1864) mainly to do away with intervening period allowed under the present Act between distraint and attachment of property and to bring at once to sale effects of ryot who refuse to pay his dues. Other steps will also be taken by Government on the executive side such as institution of disobeying area subject to such exemptions as may be ordered by the Government in favour of persons who shall, by date to be prescribed, have paid into Government treasury or to officer appointed for the purpose taxes due from them. Where land is bought in by Government owing to combination to prevent bidding, opportunity will be taken to provide land for members of depressed classes. With regard to resignations of village officers the Government say they cannot be accepted under the circumstances and if officers refuse to carry on duties they must be dismissed."

In my opinion, the Government has the right to take

precautionary measures of the kind foreshadowed. It has the right to suspend ordinary legislation when it is threatened with combined suspension of its revenue. That a wise Government would not exasperate public opinion into refusal to pay taxes is of course true. But a Government that rides roughshod over popular opinion, cannot be expected to allow itself to be extinguished without an effort. The least, therefore, it would do is to protect its revenue collection. Nor is it possible to cavil at the proposed transfer of confiscated property to the members of the depressed classes. Such an arrangement should suit both parties. Non-co-operators have undertaken to be non-violent, to risk the loss of their all for the purpose of gaining their end and must, therefore, allow their belongings to be sold. The Government, on the other hand, must try, if it can, to break the movement of non-payment and to apply all remedies just enough to secure collection. The proposal to allow the depressed classes to bid for and purchase forfeited lands is ideal. What can be better than that the forfeited lands should be temporarily occupied by the very classes whom we want to see raised from their depressed state?

I use the adverb 'temporarily,' for the present occupiers must have faith in their mission to know that they must get Swaraj and that under Swaraj they must be restored to their original status with honour added thereto. The depressed classes, who are being used as pawns in the game by the Government, cannot be adversely affected by dispossession, for it will be the primary care of the Swaraj Government to see them well-settled, happy and contented.

So much for the necessary Government measure. The panic that has possessed them shows a guilty consci-

ence. They do not rely upon their popularity to secure payment. They have to rely upon the bayonet and persecution to do so. They are arresting popular leaders and goading the people to violence so as to enable them to justify ' bloody ' measures.

And therein lies the test of the Andhras. They have hitherto proved their bravery and sacrifice. Their chosen leaders have gone to jail. Their cattle have been taken away from them and they have remained still. The worst, however, is yet to come. When the Government military is opened on them, they are expected to expose their willing breasts, not their unwilling backs, to the bullets and still not harbour revenge or resentment. They must let their utensils and belongings be taken away from them, whilst, like Draupadi or Prahlad, they are praying to God and proving their faith in Him.

Non-payment is a privilege. This is meant not to enrich the resisters, but by their voluntary poverty to enrich the nation. And they can exercise the privilege only if they have purified themselves, only if they are wearing handspun *khaddar* to the exclusion of foreign cloth and, if, being Hindus, they have washed themselves clean of the taint of untouchability and are prepared to treat the untouchable as a privileged brother. They must not grudgingly touch him, but they must lovingly embrace him and serve him. The touch must be a token of true penitence even as we expect the Government to be truly penitent regarding the many wrongs done to us. No niggardly acceptance of the inevitable will appear pleasing to God. It must be a thorough change of heart. We must share our schools with them, we must share our public places with them. We must nurse them in their sickness as we would nurse a brother. We must not be their patrons. We must not twist religious texts

against them. We must expunge texts that are of doubtful origin and are capable of interpretation against their human rights. We must gladly give up custom that is against reason, justice, and religion of the heart. We must not ignorantly cling to bad custom and part with it when we must, like a miser parting with his ill-gotten hoard out of pressure and expedience.

I have dwelt at length upon untouchability because I have received wires and letters warning me again accepting assurances of compliance with the Congress condition about untouchability. They tell me that the Andhras are not ready to give up untouchability. I urge the leaders to be strictly on the watch. The slightest deviation from the right path will irreparably injure our cause. God requires the purest sacrifice. Hinduism is on its trial equally with Islam and Christianity. Hindus will be false representatives of their religion of the Upanishads, which recognises no privilege but that of merit and which accepts nothing that does not appeal to the heart and reason.

The Andhras are a virile people proud of their traditions. They are a devoutly religious people capable of sacrifice. Much is expected of them by the country and I have every hope that they will not be found wanting. They will lose nothing by waiting if they are not ready for exact fulfilment of all conditions. But they will lose all and ill serve the country if they go to battle without full preparation.

2nd February, 1922

DANGER OF MASS MOVEMENT

Whilst there is every reason for self-gratification over mass awakening, it would be foolish to ignore its un-

doubted dangers. I have just read a notice in the papers that a girl has been pretending to be my daughter and receiving on that account all kinds of attention. I do not mind owning, I should be proud to own, thousands of good, restrained girls as my daughters. They will do credit to me and the country. The world would recognise them as members of an ever increasing family by adoption. As it is, I have to remark for the tenth time that I do not possess the good fortune to have a daughter. There is a tiny 'untouchable' girl whom I do proudly call my adopted daughter. She has brought happiness to me, and I hope by the time she has grown up she will bring truth and humility to her future field of service. To-day she is a veritable 'devil'. She believes in all play and no work. She finds it hard to work without the ebony ruler which used to keep her straight in her parental home. But I do not mind this charming idler of seven years claiming me as father. There are also some grown up girls who permit me the pleasure of claiming them as my daughters, but then they make it difficult for me to live up to the standard they exact from me. They are ever in danger of my being a discreditable father to them. But I must inform all the girls of India that I decline to run the risk of being discredited by their forcible adoption. I want certainly to adopt all the exacting girls like the ones whose names too I dare not give to the world.

But the reported forcible adoption of me by a girl is a comparatively harmless pastime. I hear that a gentleman by name Motilal Puncholi hailing from Udepur claims to be my disciple and to preach temperance and what not among the rustics of the Rajputana States. He is reported to be surrounded by an armed crowd of admirers and establishing his kingdom or some

otherdom wherever he goes. He claims too miraculous power. He or his admirers are reported also to have done some destructive work. I wish that people will once for all understand that I have no disciples. I have for the time being at any rate no existence apart from the Congress and the Khilafat Committees. All my activity is referable to these two organisations. None works in my name: none has authority to use my name save under my own writing. No one has any work save the Congress or the Khilafat work. And nobody has any authority from me to use any arms, even sticks, against any person.

I understand that these brave but simple rustics have been induced to refuse payment of taxes due to the State to which they belong. They are even told that I have asked the tax-payers belonging to the Sirohi State not to pay more than Rs. 1¼ each. Now I know nothing of all this. No one has consulted me about the matter. Pandit Ramakant Malaviya, chief minister of the State, has kindly brought the matter to my notice and he tells me that great mischief is being done in my name. If my writing reaches these countrymen at all, I would like to tell them that they should lay all their grievances before the state authorities and never resort to arms. If they wish to withhold payment of tax which they consider excessive, it is their right. But it is a right never to be exercised lightly. They must cultivate public opinion and let their case see the light of day. If they do not take these precautions, they will find everything and everybody arrayed against them and they will find themselves heavy losers in the end.

2nd February, 1922

A WARNING VOICE FROM BENGAL

There is a friend, an old and tried servant of the nation, who never fails to inform me of threatening clouds that appear in time and again on the horizon in Bengal. This time he warns me against countenancing a general non-payment movement. He thinks that precipitate action is quite likely in Bengal as most of the leaders are in jail. I cannot complain, but I cannot help noting that the imprisonment of leaders is due to the criminal folly of the Government which has treated the real peace-makers as if they were peace-breakers. The Government are inviting violence. They are, as if of a set purpose, preparing the country for violence. But here again I must not complain. I admit that most of us had expected all this and more, and yet we came to the conclusion that we had to take our courage in both our hands and move forward without faltering. Our trust then was, as it to-day is, in God.

But I know that we must take every possible precaution to avert every unexpected crisis. I have therefore strongly advised and advise again that wisdom requires that all parts of India should wait for the experiment which I have undertaken personally to supervise. Bengal has done much. She has worked wonders, she has suffered much, is still suffering and is still keeping herself under great restraint. I would appeal to all the Bengal leaders to rest on their oars and not to take a single new step. Let them by all means assert the right of free speech and free association. But there is no occasion for embarking on mass Civil Disobedience, or non-payment, which is one phase of it. The workers will have taken the masses through a richer discipline by

advising them to pay the rents due for the current period.

The following appeared in "Young India" of 9th March, 1922:

Calcutta's Unreadiness:—A correspondent in the course of a letter from Calcutta writes:

"My mind compels me to say that Bengal is doing nothing about Swadeshi in comparison to the neighbouring Province of Bihar. It is lagging far behind. Even those who boast themselves of being volunteers are not clad in *khaddar*. I have travelled through almost all the important quarters of this great town, but have not found a single person clad in *khaddar*. In Bihar, on the other hand, you will rarely find a man wearing foreign cloth. In the villages they have not yet begun to wear *khaddar dhoties,* but the attempt is being made to replace mill-made *dhoties* with *khaddar* ones."

I have merely given a few extracts from the correspondent's letter. He goes on to say that, if Calcutta's unpreparedness is reflected in the villages of Bengal also, the battle of Satyagraha cannot be won. This letter is supported by several others, but I am not prepared to admit that even in Calcutta no progress has been done in the *khaddar* movement. At the same time, I fear that the charge against Calcutta is mainly true. *Khaddar* wear in Calcutta is rather an exception than the rule, and there is no denying the fact that full Satyagraha is impossible without full compliance with the conditions precedent. If we are to usher in peaceful Swaraj—and Swaraj attained by peaceful means must be peaceful Swaraj—we must be as ready for construction as we seem to be for destruction. Boycott and manufacture, evacuation and occupation, disobedience and

obedience must go hand in hand, if we are to avoid an interval of confusion, anarchy and civil strife. The *khaddar* movement is the largest part of construction. We dare not neglect it if the struggle is to remain non-violent to the end.

9th February, 1922

AGGRESSIVE *vs.* DEFENSIVE

It is now necessary to understand the exact distinction between aggressive Civil Disobedience and defensive. Aggressive, assertive or offensive Civil Disobedience is non-violent, wilful disobedience of laws of the state whose breach does not involve moral turpitude and which is undertaken as a symbol of revolt against the state. Thus disregard of laws relating to revenue or regulation of personal conduct for the convenience of the state, although such laws in themselves inflict no hardship and do not require to be altered, would be assertive, aggressive or offensive Civil Disobedience.

Defensive Civil Disobedience, on the other hand, is involuntary or reluctant non-violent disobedience of such laws as are in themselves bad and obedience to which would be inconsistent with one's self-respect or human dignity. Thus formation of volunteer corps for peaceful purposes, holding of public meetings for like purposes, publication of articles not contemplating or inciting to violence in spite of prohibitory orders, is defensive Civil Disobedience. And so is conducting of peaceful picketing undertaken with a view to wean people from things or institutions picketed in spite of orders to the contrary. The fulfilment of the conditions mentioned above is as necessary for defensive Civil Disobedience as for offensive Civil Disobedience.

9th February, 1922

AMONG CHRISTIAN CIRCLES

The talk, I hear, is going the round among Christian circles that I have said in private conversation that had India been equipped for the use of arms, I would certainly have resorted to and advised the use of arms. I had fondly hoped that such a thing could never have been said and believed of me in India. I assure my Christian and other readers that I have never made any such statement to any person whatsoever. On the contrary, it has been my belief and practice for over forty years deliberately to practise the doctrine of Non-resistance to evil, not to retaliate. There are more instances than one in my public life when, with the ability to retaliate, I have refrained from doing so and advised friends to do likewise. My life is dedicated to the spread of that doctrine. I read it in the teaching of all the greatest teachers of the world, Zoroaster, Mahavir, Daniel, Jesus, Mahomed, Nanak and a host of others. Indeed, I am not sure that we do justice to Moses when we impute to him the doctrine of retaliation in the sense that he made it obligatory on his followers to exact an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. It may be my wish that is father to the thought. But I do think that in an age when people were unrestrained in their appetite for the enemy's blood, Moses restricted retaliation to equal measure and no more. But I must not lead the reader into religious discussion. Whilst, however, non-violence is now, has ever been, and I pray to God it ever may be, my final creed for all occasions, it is true that there are thousands in the ranks of Non-co-operation, with whom non-violence is an expedient or a policy to which they are not com-

mitted for all time and all circumstances. They believe that for India as she is constituted, there is no method but that of non-violence for regaining her freedom. And this they believe, not merely because she has no arms or training in them, but also because with her diverse creeds and races there is nothing for her but constant internecine strife, if her children began the habit of invoking the God of war for every occasion. The best of us are beginning to see more in the doctrine of non-violence than when we first approached it.

In this connection, my attention has also been drawn to a paragraph in the *Dnyanodaya* ; Sadhu Sundarsingh, it is there stated, 'made quite plain his profound disapproval of Mr. Gandhi's methods, telling him in so many words that they can lead India to nothing but ruin and useless suffering.' I am sorry that the Sadhu's name has been thus dragged into the controversy. But now that it has been, in justice to the Sadhu and the cause, I must say that, so far as my recollection goes, not only did he not disapprove of my methods in 'so many words', but he entirely approved of them and agreed that India had no other choice. We had the closest communion. The Sadhu came purposely to understand some things about which he had no first-hand knowledge. He did not know, for instance, what the implications of the Hindu-Muslim friendship were and where the minorities stood and whether the movement could remain non-violent to the end. We had long discussions over all these and other matters, and he certainly left on me the impression that for a religious man there was no course left open. The greatest difficulty undoubtedly is about the masses keeping non-violent to the end. With men nothing may be possible, for God nothing is impossible. I would fain have avoided any reference whatsoever to our

conversation. But the friends who have brought the matter to my notice tell me that Sadhu Sundersingh is on the waters, and that the paragraph in question is being exploited to wean Indian Christians from the movement. It has to stand or fall on its own merits. No certificate can save it, if its professors betray their trust; no condemnation can injure it permanently if the professors remain true to it to the end. But I felt that I could not withhold from the public what I knew about Sadhu Sundersingh's views.

9th February, 1922

CAUTION ABOUT CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Writing of his own District, Lala Shyamlal of Maltra says: "The District Magistrate here does not believe in making arrests, unless there is apprehension of a breach of the peace. The result is that our volunteers are having their own way. No foreign cloth is being imported. No liquor contract has been sold." Lala Shyamlal then inquires whether in the districts where no arrests are made people should go out of their way to court arrest. I thought that I had made the position absolutely clear in previous issues. Whilst we may do nothing to avoid arrest in the ordinary course of our duty, we must not go outside our beat in order to compel arrest. That would be either aggressive Civil Disobedience or criminal disobedience. The latter is out of question. The former, *i.e.*, aggressive Civil Disobedience is a right to be exercised when necessary and when we are thoroughly ready, and is also a duty we must discharge if we are ready and circumstances require the performance of it. But aggressive Civil Disobedience,

whether mass or individual, is a most dangerous weapon though also most effective among all the peaceful weapons at our disposal. I am myself satisfied that the country as a whole is not ready for this form of self-assertion. We have to go through much greater and stricter discipline. We have to understand the exact, I was almost going to say, the spiritual value of obedience to laws and discipline which may be irksome and even repugnant to us. Assertive Civil Disobedience is a right that accrues to us only after severe *tapasya* through which we have not yet gone. Any premature resort to assertive Civil Disobedience therefore may precipitate a crisis we neither anticipate nor want, and which we must avoid by every means we can think of. The least, therefore, that we must do is to await the result of the experiment I personally wish to conduct. It is a new thing and surely, simple prudence requires us to watch that experiment. Indeed, if aggressive Civil Disobedience, whether mass or individual, is attempted in other parts of India, it is likely to embarrass me and damage the country's cause. I invite the attention of all Non-co-operators to the resolution of the Working Committee * which now makes it incumbent upon all the Congress organisations to refrain from aggressive Civil Disobedience except with my express consent and, so far as I can see, the only exception I am likely to make will be in favour of a group of 100 villages in Andhradesha. But even there I have informed Sjt. Konda Venkatapayya that, if it is at all possible for him to avoid taking the offensive, I would appreciate it, and that he would resort to it, only if he found that retracing would be demoralising and if, humanly speaking, he was certain of non-violence being

* *See* appendix.

observed throughout Andhradesha, and also certain that the other conditions laid down by the Congress were strictly fulfilled. I have a suspicion that in many parts of India the condition about the hand-spun *khadi* is not being strictly carried out and that we are not yet everywhere cured of the disease of untouchability. In my opinion, the ability to go to jail is of far less consequence than ability and the readiness to observe in their fulness the conditions about Hindu-Muslim-Sikh-Parsi-Christian unity, about untouchability and hand-spun *khadi*. Without a due fulfilment of these conditions, we shall find that all our going to jail is bravado and so much wasted effort. Self-purification is the main consideration in seeking the prison. Embarrassment of the Government is a secondary consideration. It is my unalterable conviction that, even though the Government may not feel embarrassed in any way whatsoever by the incarceration or even execution of an innocent, unknown but a purified person, such incarceration will be the end of that Government. Even a single lamp dispels the deepest darkness. Non-co-operation is not allopathic treatment, it is homeopathic. The patient does not taste the drops given to him. He is sometimes even incredulous, but if the homeopaths are to be trusted, the tasteless drops or the tiny pills of homeopathy are far more potent than ounce dozes or choking pills of allopathy. I assure the reader that the effect of purifying Non-co-operation is more certain than the effect of homeopathic medicine. I do wish, therefore, that everywhere non-co-operators will insist upon due fulfilment of all the conditions of civil disobedience. One may be a lawyer, title-holder, even a councillor and yet properly eligible for Civil Disobedience, if he is sincerely non-violent in thought, word and deed, wears

hand-spun *khadi* as a sacred duty, shuns untouchability as an intolerable evil and believes in the unity of all races and classes of India as for all times essential for the well-being and the attainment, as also retention, of Swaraj.

23rd February, 1922

ESSENCE OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

A friend, a Congress official, writes from Simla :

"In the present mood of my countrymen, I find certain members belonging to different Congress organisations, in order to comply with your behests regarding the practising of Civil Disobedience, have found out certain novel methods of disobeying law by staging certain plays which have been proscribed by the Government, for instance *Zakhmi-i-Punjab* which was staged sometime ago in Multan and very recently in Simla, resulting in arrests in both the cases. Now, may I ask your opinion about this form of disobedience which was practised before the date fixed as laid down in the resolution of the All-India Congress Committee, *viz.*, 15th January 1922? Further, were the actors in these plays justified in informing the Government in a spirit of defiance beforehand that they were going to stage a proscribed play and by such action inviting arrests?

"Furthermore, I will draw your attention to the stormy literature which is issuing forth from Delhi and other places in the shape of cheap poetical booklets and is being recited by small boys and by certain irresponsible volunteers (for I must call them irresponsible) containing matter which is obviously inconsistent with the principle of non-violent Non-co-operation, inasmuch as it contains words and phrases which are calculated to

spread hatred and create contempt against every individual Englishman in this country and may result in violence. I bring this fact to your notice because, methinks, that the authors pose to be Non-co-operators and to be with you in this struggle for the salvation of our dear motherland. May I ask if this kind of propaganda, instead of proving helpful, will not bring about mischievous results ?"

The staging of the play was certainly not justified if it was done before the 15th January. It was also not justified if it was done without the consent of the Provincial Congress Committee. Every form of Civil Disobedience was subject to the previous sanction of the local Congress Committee. The staging of the play was also unjustified if the play itself was calculated needlessly to excite passions and to induce hatred. Assuming that all the conditions I have named were fulfilled, the managers were quite right in giving previous information to the Government in a dignified manner, because the essence of Civil Disobedience is that it is public and made specially known to those interested in arresting.

As to the "stormy literature", it is a sad thing that pamphlets such as the writer alludes to are being published and so largely patronised. The writer has mentioned two such booklets. I am, however, not printing the names. Some other correspondent sends me one of the booklets also for my edification and advice. The title as well as the contents are objectionable and breathe nothing but hatred. It is our duty to bring every wrong to public notice, but there are ways and ways of doing the things.* No point is gained by

* The following is from *Young India*: I gladly publish though not without sorrow, a letter (omitted in this collection) from a Madras correspondent on the recent occurrences in that city. Evidently the

putting things offensively. The offence contains in the fact itself. To embellish such facts is to detract from the demerit, and at the present moment when people are

---

hooliganism was far more serious than described in the first impressions given by Dr. Rajan. Mr. Rajagopalan is justified in blaming the Non-co-operators

It is difficult to distinguish between hooligans and Non-co-operators, when hundreds or thousands take part in smashing cars, swearing at innocent passengers or threatening a cinema-keeper. Non-co-operators cannot 'have the cake and eat it too'. They claim to be millions. They claim to have almost the whole of India at their back. We must either regulate our procedure in accordance with our creed or dissociate ourselves entirely from all mass activity, even if it involves self-ostracism. We have still many *hartals* to go through. Let Delhi, Nagpur and other places beware. I would advise them not to have any *hartals* at all, if they cannot with certainty, avoid the disgraceful scenes enacted in Bombay, and unfortunately repeated in in Madras. I hope that the Madras Congress Committee will sift the matter thoroughly and take all the blame that attaches to it. After the frightful experience of Bombay, Madras should have been fully insured against all risk of mob violence. Mr. Rajagopalan's letter is fortified with another from an active Non-co-operator. As he makes detailed charges, giving names, I simply content myself with giving a few extracts. The writer says:

"An eye-witness to the mad excesses of that day, I shall be false to my creed of non-violence, if I do not deplore the *hartal* as a miserable failure. The racial bitterness of the Pulianthope days has revived. You have probably read the bitter speeches of the 'non-Brahmin' leaders in their confederation. At a time when you are straining your every nerve to bring the moderates round to your point of view, we, in Madras, have succeeded in widening the gulf between us and the non-Brahmins on the one hand, and the Adi Dravidas on the other. The least that we can do by way of reparation is a frank confession of our weakness, and a religious endeavour from now to promote inter-communal unity, especially between the Panchamas and others."

I do not hesitate to criticise the Government for sparing neither man, woman nor child. But the Government have no creed of non-violence to fetter their discretion. Their creed is terrorism in the last resort. But non-co-operators have to be above suspicion.

under the pledge of non-violence, publication of such literature is highly reprehensible. It spreads anger and

---

Madras leaves much to be desired, if the two letters referred to by me at all tell a true story. I have little doubt that it is in the main true. Then non-co-operators and their friends have certainly not left man, woman or child free from their unholy attention. It was a bad augury of Swaraj to have interfered with women, to have molested the poor scout boys, and otherwise played havoc with the liberty of the people, no matter how provoking their participation in the welcome to the Prince was.

We have more to fear from ourselves than from the violence or mistakes of the Government. The latter, if we use them aright, do us good, as they have already.

Our own violence or untruth will be veritable death for us. If we are not able to set our own house in order we shall certainly destroy ourselves. Non-co-operation will be a byword of execration and reproach.

In this connection I cannot help noticing a cutting given to me from the *Rangoon Daily News*. It runs:

" We are credibly informed that the wife of Nizamuddin, hackney carriage owner, East Rangoon, got a divorce from her husband on Thursday last, on the ground that he disobeyed the Fatwa in taking his gharries and persuading others to ply at the time of the Prince's visit."

I make bold to say that whoever granted the divorce (assuming the truth of the statement) grievously erred against the law of Islam and decency. Divorces are not so lightly granted in Islam. If *hartals* can be brought about by means such as the foregoing statement suggests, they can do no good whatsoever. They are no free expression of public opinion, But I am less concerned with the expedience of *hartals* than with the good name of Islam and Non-co-operation. The law of Non-co-operation demands perfect toleration and respect for the opposite opinion and action. The law of Islam, in so far as a non-Muslim can speak of it, requires equally strict toleration. Nothing could have so deeply hurt the Prophet as the intoleration of the people of Mecca during the early period of his ministry towards the new Faith he was preaching. He could not possibly therefore at any time have been party to intolerance. 'There shall be no compulsion in religion' must have descended to

makes the task of offering Civil Disobedience more and more difficult.

16th February, 1922

THE CRIME OF CHAURI CHAURA

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

God has been abundantly kind to me. He has warned me the third time that there is not as yet in India that truthful and non-violent atmosphere which, and which alone, can justify mass disobedience, which can be at all described as civil which means gentle, truthful, humble, knowing, wilful yet loving, never criminal and hateful.

He warned me in 1919 when the Rowlatt Act agitation was started. Ahmedabad, Viramgam, and Kheda erred; Amritsar and Kasur erred. I retraced my steps, called it a Himalayan miscalculation, humbled myself before God and man, and stopped not merely mass Civil Disobedience, but even my own which I know was intended to be civil and non-violent.

The next time it was through the events of Bombay that God gave a terrific warning. He made me eye-witness of the deeds of the Bombay mob on the 17th November. The mob acted in the interest of Non-co-operation. I announced my intention to stop the mass Civil Disobedience which was to be immediately started

---

him, when some of his new converts were more zealous than wise in the preaching of the new faith.

Whether we are Hindus or Mussalmans or what, does not matter. The spirit of democracy which we want to spread throughout India cannot be spread by violence whether verbal or physical, whether direct, indirect or threatened.

in Bardoli. The humiliation was greater than in 1919. But it did me good. I am sure that the nation gained by the stopping. India stood for truth and non-violence by the suspension.

But the bitterest humiliation was still to come. Madras did give the warning, but I heeded it not. But God spoke clearly through Chauri Chaura. I understand that constables who were so brutally hacked to death had given much provocation. They had even gone back upon the word, just given by the Inspector, that they would not be molested, but when the procession had passed, the stragglers were interfered with and abused by the constables. The former cried out for help. The mob returned. The constables opened fire. The little ammunition they had was exhausted and they retired to the Thana for safety. The mob, my informant tells me, therefore set fire to the Thana. The self-imprisoned constables had to come out for dear life, and as they did so, they were hacked to pieces and the mangled remains were thrown into the raging flames.

It is claimed that no Non-co-operation volunteer had a hand in the brutality and that the mob had not only the immediate provocation, but they had also general knowledge of the high-handed tyranny of the police in that district. No provocation can possibly justify the brutal murder of men who had been rendered defenceless and had virtually thrown themselves on the mercy of the mob. And when India claims to be non-violent and hopes to mount the throne of Liberty through non-violent means, mob-violence even in answer to grave provocation is a bad augury. Suppose the 'non-violent' disobedience of Bardoli was permitted by God to succeed, the Government had abdicated in favour of the victors of Bardoli, who would control the unruly element

that must be expected to perpetrate inhumanity upon due provocation? Non-violent attainment of self-government presupposes a non-violent control over the violent elements in the country. Non-violent Non-co-operators can only succeed, when they have succeeded in attaining control over the hooligans of India, in other words, when the latter also have learnt patriotically or religiously to refrain from their violent activities, at least whilst the campaign of Non-co-operation is going on. The tragedy at Chauri Chaura, therefore, roused me thoroughly.

'But what about your manifesto to the Viceroy and your rejoinder to his reply'? spoke the voice of Satan. It was the bitterest cup of humiliation to drink. 'Surely it is cowardly to withdraw the next day after pompous threats to the Government and promises to the people of Bardoli.' Thus Satan's invitation was to deny Truth and therefore Religion, to deny God Himself. I put my doubts and troubles before the Working Committee and other associates whom I found near me. They did not all agree with me at first. Some of them probably do not even now agree with me. But never has a man been blessed, perhaps, with colleagues and associates so considerate and forgiving as I have. They understood my difficulty and patiently followed my argument. The result is before the public in the shape of the resolutions of the Working Committee.* The drastic reversal of practically the whole of the aggressive programme may be politically unsound and unwise, but there is no doubt that it is religiously sound, and I venture to assure the doubters that the country will have gained by my humiliation and confession of error.

The only virtue I want to claim is Truth and Non-violence. I lay no claim to superhuman powers. I want

*See *infra*.

none. I wear the same corruptible flesh that the weakest of my fellow beings wears, and am therefore as liable to err as any. My services have many limitations, but God has up to now blessed them in spite of the imperfections.

For, confession of error is like a broom that sweeps away dirt and leaves the surface cleaner than before. I feel stronger for my confession. And the cause must prosper for the retracing. Never has man reached his destination by persistence in deviation from the straight path.

It has been urged that Chauri Chaura cannot affect Bardoli. There is danger, it is argued, only if Bardoli is weak enough to be swayed by Chauri Chaura and is betrayed into violence. I have no doubt whatsoever on that account. The people of Bardoli are, in my opinion, the most peaceful in India. But Bardoli is but a speck on the map of India. Its effort cannot succeed unless there is perfect co-operation from the other parts. Bardoli's disobedience will be civil only when the other parts of India remain non-violent. Just as the addition of a grain of arsenic to a pot of milk renders it unfit as food so will the civility of Bardoli prove unacceptable by the addition of the deadly poison from Chauri Chaura. The latter represents India as much as Bardoli.

Chauri Chaura is after all an aggravated symptom. I have never imagined that there has been no violence, mental or physical, in the places where repression is going on. Only I have believed, I still believe and the pages of "Young India" amply prove, that the repression is out of all proportion to the insignificant popular violence in the areas of repression. The determined holding of meetings in prohibited area I do not call violence. The violence I am referring to is the throwing

of brickbats or intimidation and coercion practised in stray cases. As a matter of fact, in Civil Disobedience there should be no excitement. Civil Disobedience is a preparation for mute suffering. Its effect is marvellous though unperceived and gentle. But I regarded a certain amount of excitement as inevitable, a certain amount of unintended violence even pardonable, *i.e.*, I did not consider Civil Disobedience impossible in somewhat imperfect conditions. Under perfect conditions, disobedience when civil is hardly felt. But the present movement is admittedly a dangerous experiment under fairly adverse conditions.

The tragedy of Chauri Chaura is really the index finger. It shows the way India may easily go, if drastic precautions be not taken. If we are not to evolve violence out of non-violence, it is quite clear that we must hastily retrace our steps and re-establish an atmosphere of peace, re-arrange our programme and not think of starting mass Civil Disobedience until we are sure of peace being retained in spite of mass Civil Disobedience being started and in spite of Government provocation. We must be sure of unauthorised portions not starting mass Civil Disobedience.

As it is, the Congress organisation is still imperfect and its instructions are still perfunctorily carried out. We have not established Congress Committees in every one of the villages. Where we have, they are not perfectly amenable to our instructions. We have not probably more than one crore of members on the roll. We are in the middle of February, yet not many have paid the annual four annas subscription for the current year. Volunteers are indifferently enrolled. They do not conform to all the conditions of their pledge. They do not even wear hand-spun and hand-woven *khaddar*.

All the Hindu volunteers have not yet purged themselves of the sin of untouchability. All are not free from the taint of violence. Not by their imprisonment are we going to win Swaraj or serve the holy cause of the Khilafat or attain the ability to stop payment to faithless servants. Some of us err in spite of ourselves. But some others among us sin wilfully. They join volunteer corps well knowing that they are not and do not intend to remain non-violent. We are thus untruthful even as we hold the Government to be untruthful. We dare not enter the kingdom of Liberty with mere lip homage to Truth and Non-violence.

Suspension of mass Civil Disobedience and subsidence of excitement are necessary for further progress, indeed indispensable to prevent further retrogression. I hope, therefore, that by suspension every Congress man or woman will not only not feel disappointed but he or she will feel relieved of the burden of unreality and of national sin.

Let the opponent glory in our humiliation or so called defeat. It is better to be charged with cowardice and weakness than to be guilty of denial of our oath and sin against God. It is million times better to *appear* untrue before the world than to *be* untrue to ourselves.

And so, for me the suspension of mass Civil Disobedience and other minor activities that were calculated to keep up excitement is not enough penance for my having been the instrument, howsoever involuntary, of the brutal violence by the people at Chauri Chaura.

I must undergo personal cleansing. I must become a fitter instrument able to register the slightest variation in the moral atmosphere about me. My prayers must have much deeper truth and humility about them than they evidence. And for me there is nothing so helpful

and cleansing as a fast accompanied by the necessary mental co-operation.

I know that the mental attitude is everything. Just as a prayer may be merely a mechanical intonation as of a bird, so may a fast be a mere mechanical torture of the flesh. Such mechanical contrivances are valueless for the purpose intended. Again, just as a mechanical chant may result in the modulation of voice, a mechanical fast may result in purifying the body. Neither will touch the soul within.

But a fast undertaken for fuller self-expression, for attainment of the spirit's supremacy over the flesh, is a most powerful factor in one's evolution. After deep consideration, therefore, I am imposing on myself a five days' continuous fast permitting myself water. It commenced on Sunday evening, it ends on Friday evening. This is the least I must do.

I have taken into consideration the All-India Congress Committtee meeting in front of me. I have in mind the anxious pain even the five days' fast will cause many friends; but I can no longer postpone the penance nor lessen it.

I urge co-workers not to copy my example. The motive in their case will be lacking. They are not the originators of Civil Disobedience. I am in the unhappy position of a surgeon proved skilless to deal with an admittedly dangerous case. I must either abdicate or acquire greater skill. Whilst the personal penance is not only necessary but obligatory on me, the exemplary self-restraint prescribed by the Working Committee is surely sufficient penance for every one else. It is no small penance and if sincerely carried out, it can become infinitely more fruitful than a greater fulfilment of the vow of non-violence in thought, word and deed or the

spread of that spirit. It will be more than food for me during the week to observe that comrades are all silently and without idle discussion, engaged in fulfilling the constructive programme sketched by the Working Committee, in enlisting Congress members after making sure that they understand the Congress creed of truth and non-violence for the attainment of Swaraj, in daily life and religiously spinning for a fixed time, in introducing the wheel of prosperity and freedom in every home, in visiting 'untouchable' homes and finding out their wants, in inducing national schools to receive 'untouchable' children, in organising social service specially designed to find a common platform for every variety of man and woman, and in visiting the homes which the drink curse is desolating, in establishing real *Panchayats* and in organising national schools on a proper footing. The workers will be better engaged in these activities than in fasting. I hope, therefore, that no one will join me in fasting, either through false sympathy or an ignorant conception of the spiritual value of fasting.

All fasting and all penance must as far as possible be secret. But my fasting is both a penance and a punishment, and a punishment has to be public. It is penance for me and punishment for those whom I try to serve, for whom I love to live and would equally love to die. They have unintentionally sinned against the laws of the Congress, though they were sympathisers if not actually connected with it. Probably they hacked the constables—their countrymen and fellow beings—with my name on their lips. The only way love punishes is by suffering. I cannot even wish them to be arrested. But I would let them know that I would suffer for their breach of the Congress creed. I would advise those who feel guilty and repentant to hand themselves voluntarily to the

Government for punishment and make a clean confession. I hope that the workers in the Gorakhpur district will leave no stone unturned to find out the evil-doers and urge them to deliver themselves into custody. But whether the murderers accept my advice or not, I would like them to know that they have seriously interfered with Swaraj operations, that, in being the cause of the postponement of the movement in Bardoli, they have injured the very cause they probably intended to serve. I would like them to know, too, that this movement is not a cloak or a preparation for violence. I would, at any rate, suffer every humiliation, every torture, absolute ostracism and death itself to prevent the movement from becoming violent or a precursor of violence. I make my penance public also, because I am now denying myself the opportunity of sharing their lot with the prisoners. The immediate issue has again shifted. We can no longer press for the withdrawal of notifications or discharge of prisoners. They and we must suffer for the crime of Chauri Chaura. The incident proves, whether we wish it or no, the unity of life. All, including even the administrators, must suffer. Chauri Chaura must stiffen the Government, must still further corrupt the police, and the reprisals that will follow must further demoralise the people. The suspension and the penance will take us back to the position we occupied before the tragedy. By strict discipline and purification we regain the moral confidence required for demanding the withdrawal of notifications and the discharge of prisoners.

If we learn the full lesson of the tragedy, we can turn the curse into a blessing. By becoming truthful and non-violent, both in spirit and deed, and by making the swadeshi, *i.e.,* the *khaddar* programme complete, we can

establish full Swaraj and redress the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs without a single person having to offer Civil Disobedience.

23rd February, 1922

BARDOLI AND AFTER

Mahatma Gandhi wrote the following notes in "Young India" in justification of the Bardoli Decision :

Only '6 Months' Simple' for the President.—If Begum Abul Kalam Azad and the Maulana * himself complain about the inadequacy of the sentence pronounced upon the Maulana Saheb,* what must be the feeling of the President of the Congress and his devoted partner on having heard that he together with Mr. Sasmal was to have only 6 months' simple imprisonment? Why on earth the trial should have been dragged and judgment postponed if such an untheatrical sentence was to be pronounced, only the Government can tell. The gossip that was sent to me along the rails was that the Government were seeking a suitable opportunity for discharging both the Maulana and the Deshabandhu. The latest gossip which is supposed to be authentic, I dare not disclose. Nor is it of importance for the reader to know. We must take, not even excluding the President, our lot as it comes to us. I am receiving biting letters from correspondents accusing me of simplicity, of hard-heartedness, of faint-heartedness and all such kindred weaknesses. Some correspondents tell me that I have sold the cause of the prisoners. Others tell me I have thrown all my Non-co-operation views to the winds and I have been faithless to the President of the Congress. Fortunately, many years of service have given me a

*For being a member of an unlawful assembly under the Cr. L. A.

fairly tough hide and these shafts do not pierce it, but I do assure all these impatient critics that not a particle of the principle of Non-co-operation has been surrendered by the resolutions. On the contrary, refusal to suspend mass Civil Disobedience in the face of grave warnings from Nature would have meant a complete surrender of the fundamental principle of Non-co-operation. The discharge of prisoners I purposely brought to the surface when it became a point of national honour, because with the change of issue from the immediate attainment of the triple goal to the immediate attainment of the three-fold freedom, the demand for the discharge of prisoners became a natural consequence. But Chauri Chaura has raised another immediate issue, *viz.*, terrible penance and a fierce process of purification and this penitential purification requires the sacrifice of the imprisoned workers and the temporary sacrifice of many of our activities which have revivified the nation. But such things happen in all wars, much more frequently in spiritual warfare such as ours is claimed to be. I call it spiritual in the sense that we have resolutely declined to make use of physical force for the attainment of our end. We were in danger of being drifted away from our moorings, and it was necessary for us to return, but the return is merely meant to give us greater purity, greater perception and therefore greater strength, and if Non-co-operators have to become seasoned soldiers for the nation's battle, they will doubtless understand the value of waiting and preparing. He who waits for preparation or otherwise, advances the cause as much as the warrior who stands three feet deep in the trenches. All our sufferings will have been lost upon us if we do not realise these elements of the science of war, whether it is spiritual or physical.

Constructive Programme.—Hence it is that the constructive programme has been framed. It will steady and calm us. It will wake our organising spirit, it will make us industrious, it will render us fit for Swaraj, it will cool our blood. We shall be spat upon, laughed at, sworn at, may be even kicked and cursed. We must put up with it all in as much as we have harboured anger in our breasts even though we have been under the pledge of non-violence. I must frankly state that unless we can retrieve our steps deliberately, cultivate non-violence and manufature *Khaddar*, we cannot render effective help to the Khilafat, we cannot get redress of the Punjab wrong, nor can we attain Swaraj. My leadership is perfectly useless if I cannot convince co-workers and the public of the absolute and immediate necessity of vigorously prosecuting the constructive programme.

We must know whether we can get a crore men and women in all India who believe in the attaintment of Swaraj by peaceful, *i.e.*, Non-violent and legitimate, *i.e.*, truthful means.

We must get money for the prosecution of Swadeshi and we will know how many people there are in India who are willing honestly to pay one rupee out of every hundred of their past year's income to the Tilak Memorial Swaraj Fund. This subscription the Committee expects from Congressmen and sympathisers.

We must spend money like water in introducing the spinning wheel in every home, in the manufacture and the distribution of *khaddar* wherever required.

Surely we have long neglected the 'untouchable' brother. He has slaved for us too long. We must now serve him.

Our liquor picketing has done some good but not

substantial. Not till we pierce the home of the drunkard shall we make any real advance. We must know why he drinks; what we can substitute for it. We must have a census of all the drunkards of India.

Social Service Department has been looked at with the utmost contempt. If the Non-co-operation movement is not malicious, that department is a necessity. We want to render alike to friend and foe service in times of distress. We are thereby able to keep our relations sweet with all in spite of our political aloofness.

Laughing at it.—Social service and temperance reform were laughed at as part of the struggle of Swaraj. It was a painful exhibition of ignorance of the essentials of Swaraj. I claim that human mind or human society is not divided into water-tight compartments called social, political and religious. All act and react upon one another. What is more, the vast majority of Hindus and Mussalmans have joined the struggle believing it to be religious. The masses have come in, because they want to save the Khilafat and the Cow. Deprive the Mussalman of the hope of helping the Khilafat and he will shun the Congress; tell the Hindu he cannot save the Cow if he joins the Congress, he will to a man leave it. To laugh at moral reform and social service is to laugh at Swaraj, the Khilafat and the Punjab.

Even the organisation of schools was laughed at. Let us see what it means. We have demolished the prestige of Government schools. It was perhaps necessary in 1920 to do the picketing and certainly not to mind the boys being neglected, but it would be criminal any longer to picket Government schools or to neglect National institutions. We can now only draw more boys and girls by putting existing National schools on

a better footing. They have the advantage of being institutions where they breathe free air and where they are not shadowed. But the advantage of scientific training in carding, hand-spinning and hand-weaving and of having intellectual training in keeping with the requirements of the country must be added. We shall show by successful experiment the superiority of training in National schools and colleges.

Even the *Panchayats* come in for ridicule. Little did the critics realise that the masses in many parts of India had ceased to resort to law courts. If we do not organise honest *Panchayats*, they will certainly go back to the existing law courts.

Political Results.—Nor is a single step devoid of vast political results. Adequate manufacture and universal use of *khaddar* means a permanent boycott of foreign cloth and automatic distribution of sixty crores of rupees annually among the poor people. Permanent disappearance of the drink and the opium evils mean an annual saving of seventeen crores to the people and a diminution of that revenue for the Government. Constructive effort for the untouchables means the addition to the Congress ranks of six crores of men and women who will for ever be bound to the Congress. Social Service Department, if it becomes a live thing, will restore the strained relations that exist to-day among co-operators (whether Indian or English) and Non-co-operators. To work the full constructive programme therefore is to achieve all we want. To fail in fulfilling the programme is to postpone all possibility of effective Civil Disobedience.

Need of Excitement!—Some friends argue that in order to continue the struggle the people need some stimulant.

No person or nation can be kept alive merely upon stimulants. We have had much too much of it latterly. And the antidote now is a depressant. If therefore depression follows the cessation of all aggressive activities and people forsake us, it would not only not hinder our cause but help it. Then we shall not have to shoulder the responsibility for a Chauri Chaura. Then we could go forward with a steady step without any danger of having to look back. If however we can survive the depression and keep the people with us, we shall have positive proof that the people have caught the message of non-violence and that the people are as capable of doing constructive work as they have shown themselves capable of doing destructive work. Whatever the result, the present excitement must be abated at any cost.

What of the Khilafat?—Several Mussalman friends have said: "Your programme is good for Swaraj but it is too slow to be good enough for saving the Khilafat. The Khilafat question will be solved in a few months and whatever can be done must be done now." Let us examine the question. The cause of the Khilafat, thank God, is safe in the hands of Gazi Mustafa Kamal Pasha. He has retrieved the prestige of the Khilafat as no Mussalman of modern times has done. India has in my opinion helped not much by her money though that has meant something, but by Hindu-Muslim unity and by telling the Government in the plainest terms possible that India will have nothing to do with the Government and will declare complete independence if England persists in her anti-Turk policy and exploits India's resources against the Turks. The greater the strength in that declaration, the greater becomes the prestige of

Islam and the greater the power of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Some people think that mere temporary embarrassment of the Government by a few thousand men, irrespective of qualification, going to jail will make the Government yield to our wishes. Let us not underrate the power of the Government. I am sure that the Government does possess as yet the power to crush the spirit of violence. And it is nothing but violence to go to jail anyhow. It is the suffering of the pure and God-fearing which will tell, not the bluster of the rabble. The purer India becomes, the stronger she becomes. Purity is the only weapon of the weak in body. The strong in body in their insolence often mobilise their 'hard fibre' and seek to usurp the very function of the Almighty. But when that 'hard fibre' comes in contact, not with its like, but with the exact opposite, it has nothing to work against. A solid body can only move on and against another solid body. You cannot build castles in the air. Therefore, the impatient Mussalmans must see the obvious truth that the little disorganised bluster of the rabble, whether it expresses itself by going to jail or by burning buildings or by making noisy demonstrations, will be no match for the organised insolence of the 'hard fibre' of the 'most determined people in the world'. This terrific insolence can only be met by the utter humility of the pure and the meek. God helps the helpless, not those who believe they can do something. Every page of the Koran teaches me, a non-Muslim, this supreme lesson. Every *sura* of the Koran begins in the name of God, the Compassionate and the Merciful. Let us therefore be strong in soul, though weak in body.

If the Mussalmans believe in the policy of non-violence, they must give it a fair trial and they will not

have given it any trial at all, if they harbour anger, *i.e.*, violence in their breasts.

As it is, by our bluster, by show of force, by violent picketing we shall estrange more than intimidate men into co-operation with us. And how can we dare seek co-operation by compulsion when we have refused to be coerced into co-operation with the Government? Must we not observe the same law that we expect others to observe towards us?

If the Treaty of Sevres is not revised to our satisfaction, it is not finished. The virtue lies in India's determination, not to be satisfied with anything less than her demands. After all, Mustafa Kemal may not insist upon the settlement of the Jazurut-ul-Arab. We must continue the fight, so long as it is not returned intact to the Mussalmans. If the Mussalmans consider that they can gain their end by force of arms, let them secede from the non-violent alliance by all means. But if they know that they cannot, let them carry it out in thought, word and deed, and they will find that there is no surer or quicker remedy for assuaging their grief and redressing the Khilafat wrong.

'*Somersaults*'.—I have carefully read Mr. Kelkar's article in the *Mahratta* criticising the Bardoli resolutions. I acknowledge the gentle and considerate manner with which he has handled me. I wish I could persuade him and many who think like Mr. Kelkar that what he calls a somersault was an inevitable operation. Consistency is a desirable quality, but it becomes a 'hobgoblin' when it refuses to see facts. I have known dispositions of armies changed from hour to hour. Once during the Zulu revolt, we were all asleep. We had definite orders for the morrow. But suddenly at about

midnight, we were awakened and ordered to retire behind bags of grain which served as protecting walls, because the enemy was reported to be creeping up the hill on which we had encamped. In another hour it was understood that it was a false alarm and we were permitted to retire to our tents. All the 'Somersaults' were necessary changes. Remedies vary with the variation in diagnosis. The same physician one day detects malaria and gives a large dose of quinine, detects typhoid the next and stops all medicine and orders careful nursing and fasting, later detects consumption and orders change and solid food. Is the physician capricious or cautious and honest ?

Without being untruthful and indifferent, if not stupid, I could not do what Mr. Kelkar suggests I should have done at the time of the Bombay Conference. It would have been untruthful to have yielded to the Moderate friends beyond what was conceded, as the Indian sky appeared to me to be clear blue and promised to remain so. My diagnosis may be blamed but not my decision based on the then diagnosis, nor could I possibly conceal the demands especially in the teeth of the Viceregal declaration at Calcutta that nothing was to be expected in the matters of the Khilafat and the Punjab, and that, as the reforms had only just been granted, no advance was to be expected. I would have been unfair to the Viceroy as also to the Moderate friends if I had not said that our demands were emphatic and clear-cut. To have then suspended mass Civil Disobedience would have been a weakness. But Chauri Chaura darkened the horizon and I discovered a new diagnosis. It would have been idiotic on my part not to have declared in the clearest possible language that the patient required a drastic change of treatment. Not to have suspended after

Chauri Chaura would have been unpardonable weakness. I assure the reader that Bardoli's unpreparedness had nothing to do with the decision. For Bardoli, in my opinion, was quite able to give battle. I have stated several times in the columns of "Young India" and *Nava Jivan* that I considered Bardoli to be quite ready for the fray.

The fact is that the critics do not realise the implications of Civil Disobedience. They seem unconciously to ignore the potent adjective 'civil'.

The more I think of the Bardoli decision and the more I rehearse the debates and the talks at Delhi, the more convinced I am of the correctness of the decision and of the necessity of Provinces stopping all offensive activities for the time being, even at the risk of being considered weak, and forfeiting popular applause and support.

2nd March, 1922

THE ALL-INDIA CONGRESS COMMITTEE

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The session, just past, of the All-India Congress Committee was in some respects more memorable than the Congress. There is so much under-current of violence, both conscious and unconscious, that I was actually and literally praying for a disastrous defeat. I have always been in a minority. The reader does not know that in South Africa I started with practical unanimity, reached a minority of sixty-four and even sixteen, and went up again to a huge majority. The best and the most solid work was done in the wilderness of minority.

I know that the only thing that the Government dread is this huge majority I seem to command. They little

know that I dread it even more than they. I have become literally sick of the adoration of the unthinking multitude. I would feel certain of my ground if I was spat upon by them. Then there would be no need for confession of Himalayan and other miscalculations, no retracing, no re-arranging.

But it was not to be.

A friend warned me against exploiting my dictatorship. He little knew that I had never once used it, if only because the legal occasion had not yet arisen for its use. The 'dictatorship' accrues to me only when the ordinary Congress machinery is rendered unworkable by the Government.

Far from my consciously or unconsciously exploiting my 'dictatorship', I have begun to wonder if I am not unconsciously allowing myself to be 'exploited.' I confess that I have a dread of it such as I never had before. My only safety lies in my shamelessness. I have warned my friends of the Committee that I am incorrigible. I shall continue to confess blunders each time the people commit them. The only tyrant I accept in this world is the 'still small voice' within. And even though I have to face the prospect of a minority of one, I humbly believe I have the courage to be in such a hopeless minority. That to me is the only truthful position.

But I am a sadder, and I hope, a wiser man to-day. I see that our non-violence is skin-deep. We are burning with indignation. The Government is feeding it by its insensate acts. It seems almost as if the Government wants to see this land covered with murder, arson and rapine, in order to be able once more to claim exclusive ability to put them down.

This non-violence therefore seems to be due merely to our helplessness. It almost appears as if we are nursing

in our bosoms the desire to take revenge the first time we get the opportunity.

Can true voluntary non-violence come out of this seeming forced non-violence of the weak? Is it not a futile experiment I am conducting? What if, when the fury bursts, not a man, woman or child is safe and every man's hand is raised against his fellow being? Of what avail is it then, if I fast myself to death in the event of such a catastrophe coming to pass?

What is the alternative? To lie and say that what I know to be evil, is good? To say that true and voluntary co-operation will come out of false and forced co-operation is to say that light will result from darkness.

Co-operation with the Government is as much a weakness and a sin, as alliance with suspended violence.

The difficulty is almost insurmountable. Hence with the growing knowledge of the fact that this non-violence is merely superficial, I must continually make mistakes and retrace, even as a man wading his way through a tractless forest must continually stop, retrace, stumble, be hurt and even bleed.

I was prepared for a certain amount of depression, disappointment and resentment, but I confess I was totally unprepared for the hurricane of opposition. It became clear to me that the workers were in no mood to do any serious work of construction. The constructive programme lent no enchantment. They were not a social reform association. They could not wrest power from the Government by such humdrum reform work. They wanted to deliver 'non-violent' blows! All this appeared so thoroughly unreal. They would not stop to think that even if they could defeat the Government by a childish display of rage, they could not conduct the

government of the country for a single day without serious and laborious organisation and construction.

We must not go to gaol, as Mahomed Ali would say, 'on a false issue.' It is not *any* imprisonment that will lead to Swaraj. It is not *every* disobedience that will fire us with the spirit of obedience and discipline. Jails are no gate-way to liberty for the confirmed criminal. They are temples of liberty only for those who are innocence personified. The execution of Socrates made immortality a living reality for us,—not so the execution of countless murderers. There is no warrant for supposing that we can steal Swaraj by the imprisonment of thousands of nominally non-violent men with hatred, ill-will and violence raging in their breasts.

It would be otherwise, if we were fighting with arms, giving and receiving blow for blow. The imprisonment of those who may be caught intimidating, assaulting and murdering will certainly embarrass the Government and when they are tired, they would as elsewhere yield. But such is not our fight to-day. Let us be truthful. If it is through 'show of force' that we wish to gain Swaraj, let us drop non-violence and offer such violence as we may. It would be a manly, honest and sober attitude—an attitude the world has been used to for ages past. No one can then accuse us of the terrible charge of hypocrisy.

But the majority will not listen to me. In spite of all my warnings and passionate plea for rejecting my resolution, if they did not believe in non-violence as indispensable for the attainment of our goal, they accepted it without a single material change. I would ask them therefore to realise their responsibility. They are now bound not to rush to Civil Disobedience, but to settle down to the quiet work of construction. I would

urge them to be indifferent to the clamour for immediate action. The immediate action is not courting imprisonment, nor even free speech and free association or free pen, but self-purification, introspection, quiet organisation. We have lost our foothold. If we do not take care, we are likely to be drowned in the waters whose depth we do not know.

It is no use thinking of the prisoners. When I heard of Chauri Chaura, I sacrificed them as the first penitential act. They have gone to jail to be released only by the strength of the pepole, indeed the hope was the Swaraj Parliament's first act would be to open the prison gates. God had decreed otherwise. We who are outside have tried and failed. The prisoners can now only gain by serving the full term of their imprisonment. Those who went under false pretences, or under any misapprehension or under a mistaken understanding of the movement can come out by apologising and by petitioning. The movement will be all the stronger for the purging. The stoutest hearts will rejoice in the opportunity of unexpectedly greater suffering. Though thousands of Russians have 'rotted' in the Russian prisons for years and years, those unhappy people are not yet free. Liberty is a jilt most difficult to woo and please. We have shown the power of suffering. But we have not suffered enough. If the people in general keep passively non-violent and if only a few are actively, honestly and knowingly non-violent in intent, word and deed, we can reach the goal in quickest time with the least suffering. But we shall indefinitely postpone the attainment, if we send to prison men who harbour violence in their breasts.

Therefore, the duty of the majority in their respective provinces is to face taunts, insults, and if need be

depletion in their ranks, but determinedly to pursue their goal without swerving an inch. The authorities mistaking our suspension for weakness may resort to still greater oppression. We should submit to it. We should even abandon defensive Civil Disobedience and concentrate all our energy on the tasteless but health-giving economic and social reform. We should bend down on our knees and assure the Moderates that they need fear no harm from us. We should assure the Zamindars that we have no ill-will against them.

The average Englishman is haughty, he does not understand us, he considers himself to be a superior being. He thinks that he is born to rule us. He relies upon his forts or his gun to protect himself. He despises us. He wants to compel co-operation, *i.e.*, slavery. Even him we have to conquer, not by bending the knee, but remaining aloof from him, but at the same time not hating him nor hurting him. It is cowardly to molest him. If we simply refuse to regard ourselves as his slaves and pay homage to him, we have done our duty. A mouse can only shun the cat. He cannot treat with her till she has filed the points of her claws and teeth. At the same, time we must show every attention to those few Englishmen who are trying to cure themselves and fellow Englishmen of the disease of race superiority.

The minority has different ideals. It does not believe in the programme. Is it not right and patriotic for them to form a new party and a new organisation? They will then truly educate the country. Those who do not believe in the creed should surely retire from the Congress. Even a national organisation must have a creed. One, for instance, who does not believe in Swaraj has no place in the Congress. I submit that even so has one who does not believe in 'peaceful and legitimate means'

no place in the Congress. A Congressman may not believe in Non-co-operation and still remain in it, but he cannot believe in violence and untruth and still be a Congressman. I was therefore deeply hurt when I found opposition to the note in the resolution about the creed and still more when I found opposition to my paraphrase of the two adjectives 'peaceful' and 'legitimate' into 'non-violent' and 'truthful' respectively. I had reasons for the paraphrase. I was seriously told that the creed did not insist upon non-violence and truth as the indispensable means for the attainment of Swaraj. I agreed to remove the paraphrase in order to avoid a painful discussion, but I felt that truth was stabbed.

I am sure that those who raised this opposition are as patriotic as I claim to be, they are as eager for Swaraj as every other Congressman. But I do say that the patriotic spirit demands their loyal and strict adherence to non-violence and truth and that if they do not believe in them, they should retire from the Congress organisation.

Is it not national economy to let all the ideals be sharply defined and to work independently of one another? That then which is most popular will win the day. If we are going to evolve the real spirit of democracy, we shall not do so by obstruction but by abstention.

The session of the All-India Congress Committee was a forcible demonstration of the fact that *we* are retarding the country's progress towards Swaraj, and not the Government. Every mistake of the Government helps. Every neglect of duty on our part hinders.

2nd March, 1922

THE BARDOLI RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was passed on the 25th ultimo at the session of the All-India Congress Committee held at Delhi:

The All-India Congress Committee having carefully considered the resolutions passed by the Working Committee at its meeting held at Bardoli on the 11th and 12th instant, confirms the said resolutions noted therein and further resolves that individual Civil Disobedience whether of a defensive or aggressive character may be commenced in respect of particular places or particular laws at the instance of and upon permission being granted therefor by the respective Provincial Committee; provided that such Civil Disobedience shall not be permitted unless all the conditions laid down by the Congress or the All-India Congress Committee or the Working Committee are strictly fulfilled.

Reports having been received from various quarters that picketing regarding foreign cloth is as necessary as liqour-picketing, the All-India Congress Committee authorises such picketing of a *bona fide* character on the same terms as liquor-picketing mentioned in the Bardoli resolutions. The All-India Congress Committee wishes it to be understood that the resolutions of the Working Committee do not mean any abandonment of the original Congress programme of Non-co-operation or permanent abandonment of Mass Civil Disobedience, but considers that an atmosphere of necessary mass non-violence can be established by the workers concentrating upon the constructive programme framed by the Working Committee at Bardoli.

* Given below.

The All-India Congress Committee holds Civil Disobedience to be the right and duty of the people to be exercised and performed, whenever the State opposes the declared will of the people.

Note:—Individual Civil Disobedience is disobedience of orders or laws by a single individual or an ascertained number or group of individuals. Therefore a prohibited public meeting where admission is regulated by tickets and to which no unauthorised admission is allowed, is an instance of Individual Civil Disobedience, whereas a prohibited meeting to which the general public is admitted without any restriction is an instance of Mass Civil Disobedience. Such Civil Disobedience is defensive when a prohibited public meeting is held for conducting a normal activity, although it may result in arrest. It would be aggressive if it is held not for any normal activity, but merely for the purpose of courting arrest and imprisonment.

The following appeared in "Young India" of 2nd March, 1922:

The Bardoli Resolutions: (As revised and confirmed by the A. I. C. C., 11th February, 1922):

1. The Working Committee deplores the inhuman conduct of the mob at Chauri Chaura, in having brutally murdered constables and wantonly burnt the police *thana* and tenders its sympathy to the families of the bereaved.

In view of Nature's repeated warnings every time mass Civil Disobedience has been imminent and some popular violent outburst has taken place indicating that the atmosphere in the country is not non-violent enough for mass Civil Disobedience, the latest instance being the tragic and terrible events at Chauri Chaura near Gorakhpur, the Working Committee of the Congress resolves

that mass Civil Disobedience contemplated at Bardoli and elsewhere be suspended, and instructs the local Congress Committees forthwith to advise the cultivators to pay the land revenue and other taxes due to the Government and whose payment might have been suspended in anticipation of mass Civil Disobedience, and instructs them to suspend every other preparatory activity of an offensive nature.

The suspension of mass Civil Disobedience shall be continued till the atmosphere is so non-violent as to ensure the non-repetition of popular atrocities such as at Gorakhpur or hooliganism such as at Bombay and Madras respectively on the 17th November 1921 and 13th January last.

In order to promote a peaceful atmosphere, the Working Committee advises till further instructions all Congress organisations to stop activities specially designed to court arrest and imprisonment save normal Congress activities including voluntary *hartals* wherever an absolutely peaceful atmosphere can be assured and for that end all picketing shall be stopped save for the *bona-fide* and peaceful purpose of warning the visitors to liquor-shops against the evils of drinking, such picketing to be controlled by persons of known good character and specially selected by the Congress Committees concerned.

The Working Committee advises till further instructions the stoppage of all volunteer processions and public meetings merely for the purpose of defiance of the notification regarding such meetings; this, however, shall not interfere with the private meetings of Congress and other Committees or public meetings which are required for the conduct of the normal activities of the Congress.

Complaints having been brought to the notice of the Working Committee that ryots are not paying rents to the Zemindars, the Working Committee advises Congress workers and organisations to inform the ryots that such witholding of rents is contrary to the resolutions of the Congress and that it is injurious to the best interests of the country.

The Working Committee assures the Zemindars that the Congress movement is in no way intended to attack their legal rights and that even where the ryots have grievances, the Committee's desire is that redress should be sought by mutual consultations and by the usual recourse to arbitration.

Complaints having been brought to the notice of the Working Committee that in the formation of Volunteer Corps great laxity prevails in the selection and that insistence is not had on the full use of hand-spun and hand-woven *khaddar* and on the full observance by Hindus of the rule as to the removal of untouchability nor is care being taken to ascertain that the candidates believe fully in the observance of non-violence in intent, word and deed in terms of the Congress resolution, the Working Committee calls upon all Congress organisations to revise their lists and remove from them the names of all such volunteers as do not strictly conform to the requirements of the pledge.

The Working Committee is of opinion that unless Congressmen carry out to the full the Congress constitution and the resolutions from time to time issued by the Working Committee, it is not possible to achieve its objects expeditiously or at all.

The foregoing resolution will have effect only pending the meeting to be specially convened of the All-India Congress Committee and thereafter subject to confirmation

by it, the secretary to call such meeting as early as possible after consultation with Hakim Ajmal Khan.

II. In the opinion of the Working Committee a project is necessary for the purpose of finding employment for those who may give up Government service and to that end the Committee appoints Messrs. Mian Mahomed Haji Jan Mahomed Chhotani, Jamnalal Bajaj and V. J. Patel to draw up a scheme for consideration by the special meeting of the All-India Congress Committee.

III. 12th February: Whereas the Gorakhpur tragedy is a powerful proof of the fact that the mass-mind has not yet fully realised the necessity of non-violence as an integral, active and chief part of Mass Civil Disobedience, and whereas the reported indiscriminate acceptance of persons as volunteers in contravention of the Congress instructions betrays want of appreciation of the vital part of Satyagraha and whereas in the opinion of the Working Committee the delay in the attainment of the national aim is solely due to the weak and incomplete execution in practice of the constitution of the Congress and with a view to perfecting the internal organisation:

The Working Committee advises all Congress organisations to be engaged in the following activities:

(1) To enlist at least one crore of members of the Congress.

Note (i):—Since *peaceful* * and *legitimate means*† are the essence of the Congress creed, no person should be enlisted who does not believe in such means as indispensable for the attainment of Swaraj. The creed of the

* Replaced for *peace (non-violence).*

† " " *legitimateness (truth).*

This is a fresh addition.

Congress must therefore be carefully explained to each person who is appealed to, to join the Congress.

Note (ii):—The workers should note that no one who does not pay the annual subscription can be regarded as a qualified Congressman; all the old members are therefore to be advised to re-register their names.

(2) To popularise the Spinning Wheel and to organise the manufacture of hand-spun and hand-woven khaddar *and popularise its use by house to house visit.**

Note (i):—To this end all workers and office-bearers should be dressed in *khaddar* and it is recommended that, with a view to encourage others, they should themselves learn hand-spinning.

(3) To organise national schools.

Note:—No picketing of Government schools should be resorted to, but reliance should be placed upon the superiority of national schools in all vital matters to *draw students from Government and aided schools.*†

(4) To organise the Depressed Classes for a better life, to improve their social, mental and moral condition, to induce them to send their children to national schools and to provide for them the ordinary facilities which the other citizens enjoy.

Note:—Whilst therefore where the prejudice against the untouchables is still strong in places, separate schools and separate wells must be maintained out of Congress funds, every effort should be made to draw such children to national schools and to persuade the people to allow the untouchables to use the common wells.

(5) To organise the temperance campaign amongst the people addicted to the drink habit by house to house

* Replaced by the A. I. C. C. for *said.*

† Replaced for *command attendance.*

visits and to rely more upon appeal to the drinker in his home than upon picketing.

(6) To organise village and town *panchayats* for the private settlement of all disputes, reliance being placed solely upon the force of public opinion and the truthfulness of *panchayat* decisions to ensure obedience to them.

Note:—In order to avoid even the appearance of coercion, no social boycott should be resorted to against those who will not obey *panchayat's* decisions.

(7) In order to promote and emphasize unity among all classes and races and mutual good-will, the establishment of which is the aim of the movement of Non-co-operation, to organise a social service department that will render help to all irrespective of differences in times of illness or accident.

Note:—A Non-co-operator, whilst firmly adhering to his creed, will deem it a privilege to render personal service in case of illness or accident to every person whether English or Indian.

(8) To continue the Tilak Memorial Swaraj Fund and to call upon every Congressman or Congress sympathiser to pay at least one hundredth part of his *annual income* for the year 1921, every Province to send every month 25 per cent of its income from the Tilak Memorial Swaraj Fund to the All-India Congress Committee.

The above resolutions shall be brought before the forthcoming session of the All-India Congress Committee for revision if necessary.*

* Revised as above stated.

9th March, 1922

INTERESTING INFORMATION

Though now stale, the report issued by Messrs. Prakasam, Nageshwara Row and Narayan Rao about the preparedness for mass Civil Disobedience of the areas selected by the Guntur District Congress Committee makes interesting reading. The Commissioners divide the area into two parts: Peddanandipadu Firka and all the neighbouring villages forming one contiguous whole, and the second the rest of the Firkas consisting of Palnad, Vinukonda, Settanapalle and portions of Ongole, Narasaraopet, Tenali and Repalle. The Commissioners found that the second part of the selected area fully satisfied the conditions about *Khaddar* but not so about untouchability, although there was a great advance in the mentality of the people. As to non-violence, whilst the Commissioners admit that the people are non-violent by temperament, they say: "Still we doubt whether they could withstand a provocation or insult if it is of an extreme nature." They found that the condition about Hindu-Muslim unity was largely fulfilled.

Of the first part of the area, the Commissioners are much more enthusiastic. They estimate the total number of volunteers at about 4,000. "They are clad in *khaddar* uniform with badges. Men of all ages have enlisted themselves. We found even men of 60 to 65 years doing active work. In some villages there were Panchama volunteers doing active work and freely mixing with others. The excellence of the organisation among these ryots consists in their devotion to duty and observance of non-violence as part of their religion."

As to *Khaddar* the Commissioners remark: "Most of the villages are self-contained. In some villages almost

every house has one or more *charkhas* actually working. The yarn made in each village is woven generally by the village Panchamas. Even orthodox Brahmins have been getting their clothes made by their Panchama brethren. In most of the villages more than 50 per cent. wear *khaddar* made by themselves. In some the percentage is as high as 95.'

Remarking upon untouchability, they say: "We were surprised at the extraordinary progress made by some of the villages in this area in their attempt to remove untouchability within so short a time. We could not believe that it was humanly possible to effect such a revolution in the minds of these countrymen of ours. We found the so-called untouchables admitted into the *panchayat* Board. In some places orthodox Brahmins took the Panchamas by hand and seated them in their midst, and in some places they are admitted into the premises of Brahmins to do the same services which other castes have been doing. One rich Brahmin gentleman told us that he and some of his friends in the neighbouring villages would spend all their income to make provision for their needy Panchama brethren." Their final opinion, however, is: "In some villages untouchability has ceased to exist and in several it is likely to disappear soon. We consider the progress not uniform and not sufficient." Their final summing-up is: "No doubt all this is a good record, but it is difficult to see how far the masses can remain absolutely peaceful if more drastic and inhuman measures are employed. The time at their disposal for discipline has been too short. They have been just at the beginning of the fight. We consider it more advisable to postpone the campaign until the people have sufficient time to steel their hearts against all engines of oppression."

I have given relevant extracts from this valuable report to show: (1) the utter impartiality with which the Commissioners approach their mission, (2) the marvellous progress made in the selected area in fulfilling the conditions laid down by the Congress, (3) the necessity for much greater work before the idea of Civil Disobedience could be approached with any confidence. I am aware that extraordinary efforts were being put forth in many parts of India for the fulfilment of the Congress conditions in order that the people might be able to exercise the privilege of Civil Disobedience. That in itself is certainly a matter for congratulation, but the work of construction ought not to have to depend upon stimulation. It must go on irrespective of the excitement of Civil Disobedience. Removal of untouchability, manufacture of *khaddar*, Hindu-Muslim unity, cultivation of non-violence are not measures of a temporary character. They are the four pillars on which the structure of Swaraj must for ever rest. Take away any one of them and it must topple down. The greater, therefore, the progress in these four matters, the nearer we are to Swaraj, and the nearer also to capacity for Civil Disobedience. Indeed, even disobedience, if it is truly civil, excludes the idea of excitement. When Daniel threw open his doors in defiance of the laws of Medes and Persians, when John Bunyan became a non-conformist, when Latimer thrust his hand into the fire, when Prahlad embraced the red-hot iron pillar, not one of these civil resisters of old resisted under excitement. On the contrary they were, if possible, more collected and deliberate than on ordinary occasions. Absence of excitement is an infallible test of Civil Disobedience. I therefore hope that the good people of the selected area will not go to sleep now that mass Civil Disobedience

has been suspended. but that they will go on with the programme of construction with greater zeal and devotion.

10th November, 1920

IF I AM ARRESTED——

(TRANSLATED FROM MR. GANDHI'S ARTICLE IN *Navjivan*)

I have been constantly thinking of what the people would do in case I am arrested. My co-workers also have been putting this question to me. What would be the plight of India, if the people took to the wrong path through love run mad? What would be my own plight in such a case?

Rivers of blood shed by the Government cannot frighten me; but I would be deeply pained even, if the people did so much as abuse the Government for my sake or in my name. It would be disgracing me if the people lost their equilibrium on my arrest. The nation can achieve no progress merely by depending upon me. Progress is possible only by their understanding and following the path suggested by me. For this reason I desire that the people should maintain perfect self-control and consider the day of my arrest as a day of rejoicing. I desire that even the weaknesses existing to-day should disappear at that time.

What can be the motive of the Government in arresting me? The Government are not my enemy, for I have not a grain of enmity towards them. But they believe that I am the soul of all this agitation, that, if I am removed, the ruled and the rulers would be left in peace, that the people are blindly following me. Not only the Government, but some of our leaders also

share this belief. How, then, can the Government put the people to the test? How can the Government ascertain whether the people understand my advice or are simply dazzled by my utterances? The only way left to them is to arrest me. Of course, there still remains an alternative for them and that lies in the removal of the causes which have led me to offer this advice. But intoxicated as they are with power, the Government will not see their own fault and even if they do, they will not admit it. The only way then that remains for them is to measure the strength of the people. They can do this by arresting me. If the people are thus terrorised into submission, they can be said to deserve the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs.

If, on the other hand, the people resort to violence, they will merely be playing into the hands of the Government. Their aeroplanes will then bomb the people, their Dyers will shoot into them, and their Smiths will uncover the veils of our women. There will be other officers to make the people rub their noses against the ground, crawl on their bellies, and undergo the scourge of whipping. Both those results will be equally bad and unfortunate. They will not lead to *Swaraj*. In other countries governments have been overthrown by sheer brute-force, but I have often shown that India cannot attain *Swaraj* by that force. What, then, should the people do if I am arrested? The answer now is simple. The people

(1) should preserve peace and calmness,
(2) should not observe *Hartals*,
(3) should not hold meetings,
but
(4) should be fully awake.

I should certainly expect—

(5) all the Government schools to be vacated and shut down.

(6) Lawyers to withdraw from practice, in greater numbers.

(7) Settlement by private arbitration of cases pending before the law Courts.

(8) Opening of numerous national schools and colleges.

(9) Renunciation of all foreign cloth in favour of the exclusive use of hand spun and hand woven garments by lacs of men and women, and selling or burning of any foreign cloth in stock.

(10) None to enlist in the army or in any other Government Service.

(11) Those able to earn their livelihood by other means to give up Government Services, civil and even military.

(12) Contribution of as much as is wanted towards national funds.

(13) Title holders to surrender titles in greater numbers.

(14) Candidates to withdraw from elections, or if already elected to resign their seats.

(15) Voters, who have not yet made up their minds, to resolve that it is sin to send any representative to the Councils.

If the people resolve and carry this out, they would not have to wait for *Swaraj* even for a year. If they can exhibit this much strength, we shall have attained *Swaraj*.

I shall then be set free under the nation's seal. That will please me. My freedom to-day is like a prison to me.

It will only prove the peoples' incompetence, if they use violence to release me, and then depend upon my

help to attain *Swaraj* for them. Neither I nor anyone else can get *Swaraj* for the nation. It will be got on the nation proving its own fitness.

In conclusion, it is useless to find fault with the Government. We get what government we deserve. When we improve, the government also is bound to improve. Only when we improve can we attain Swaraj. Non-co-operation is the nation's determination to improve. Will the nation abandon the resolve and begin to co-operate after my arrest? If the people become mad and take to violence and as a result of it crawl on their bellies, rub their noses on the ground, salute the Union Jack and walk eighteen miles to do it, what else is that but co-operation? It is better to die than to submit to crawling, &c. In fine, consider it from any point of view, the course suggested by me is the right one for the people to take.

9th March, 1922

IF I AM ARRESTED——

(BY M. K. GANDHI)

The rumour has been revived that my arrest is imminent. It is said to be regarded as a mistake by some officials that I was not arrested when I was to be, *i.e.*, on the 11th or 12th of February, and that the Bardoli decision ought not to have been allowed to affect the Government's programme. It is said, too, that it is now no longer possible for the Government to withstand the ever rising agitation in London for my arrest and deportation. I myself cannot see how the Government can avoid arresting me, if they want a permanent abandonment of Civil Disobedience, whether individual or mass.

I advised the Working Committee to suspend mass

Civil Disobedience at Bardoli, because that disobedience would not have been civil, and if I am now advising all provincial workers to suspend even individual Civil Disobedience, it is because I know that any disobedience at the present stage will be not civil but criminal. A tranquil atmosphere is an indispensable condition of Civil Disobedience. It is humiliating for me to discover that there is a spirit of violence abroad and that the Government of the United Provinces has been obliged to enlist additional police for avoiding a repetition of Chauri Chaura. I do not say that all that is claimed to have happened has happened, but it is impossible to ignore all the testimony that is given in proof of the growing spirit of violence in some parts of those provinces. In spite of my political differences with Pundit Hridayanath Kunzru, I regard him to be above wilful perversion of truth. I consider him to be one of the most capable among public workers. He is not a man to be easily carried away. When, therefore, he gives an opinion upon anything, it immediately arrests my attention. Making due allowance for the colouring of his judgment by reason of his pro-Government attitude, I am unable to dismiss his report of the Chauri Chaura tragedy as unworthy of consideration. Nor is it possible to ignore letters received from Zemindars and others informing me of the violent temperament and ignorant lawlessness in the United Provinces. I have before me the Bareilly report signed by the Congress Secretary. Whilst the authorities behaved like madmen and forgot themselves in their fit of anger, we are not, if that report is to be believed, without fault. The volunteer procession was not a civil demonstration. It was insisted upon in spite of a sharp division of opinion in our own ranks. Though the crowds that gathered were not violent, the

spirit of the demonstrations was undoubtedly violent. It was an impotent show of force wholly unnecessary for our purpose and hardly a prelude to Civil Disobedience. That the authorities could have handled the procession in a better spirit, that they ought not to have interfered with the Swaraj flag, that they ought not to have objected to the use of the Town Hall which was town property as Congress offices in view of the fact that it had been so used for some months with the permission of the Town Council, is all very true. But we have ceased to give credit to the authorities for common or reasonable sense. On the contrary, we have set ourselves against them because we expect nothing but unreason and violence from them, and knowing that the authorities would act no better than they did, we should have refrained from all the previous irritating demonstrations. That the U. P. Government are making a mountain out of a mole-hill, that they are discounting their own provocation given by the murdered men at Chauri Chaura is nothing new. All that I am concerned with is that it is not possible for us to claim that we have given them no handle whatsoever. It is therefore as a penance that Civil Disobedience has been suspended. But if the atmosphere clears up, the people realise the full value of the adjective 'civil' and become in reality non-violent both in spirit and in deed, and if I find that the Government still do not yield to the people's will, I shall certainly be the first person to advocate individual or mass Civil Disobedience as the case may be. There is no escape from that duty without the people wishing to surrender their birthright.

I doubt the sincerity of Englishmen who are born fighters, when they declaim against Civil Disobedience as if it was a diabolical crime to be punished with

exemplary severity. If they have glorified armed rebellions and resorted to them on due occasions, why are many of them up in arms against the very idea of civil resistance? I can understand their saying that the attainment of a non-violent atmosphere is a virtual impossibility in India. I do not believe it, but I can appreciate such an objection. What, however, is beyond my comprehension is the deadset made against the very theory of Civil Disobedience, as if it was something immoral. To expect me to give up the preaching of Civil Disobedience is to ask me to give up preaching peace, which would be tantamount to asking me to commit suicide.

I have now been told that the Government are compassing the destruction of the three weeklies which I am conducting, viz., *Young India, Gujarati Nava Jivan* and *Hindi Nava Jivan*. I hope that the rumour has no foundation. I claim that these three journals are insistently preaching nothing but peace and good will. Extraordinary care is taken to give nothing but truth as I find it, to the readers. Every inadvertent inaccuracy is admitted and corrected. The circulation of all the weeklies is daily growing. The conductors are voluntary workers, in some cases taking no salary whatsoever and in the others receiving mere maintenance money. Profits are all returned to the subscribers in some shape or other or are utilised for some constructive public activity or other. I cannot say that I shall not feel a pang, if these journals cease to exist. But it is the easiest thing for the Government to put them out. The publishers and printers are all friends and co-workers. My compact with them is that the moment Government asks for security, that moment the newspapers must stop. I am conducting them upon the assumption that

whatever view the Government may take of my activities, they at least give me credit for preaching through these newspapers nothing but the purest non-violence and truth, according to my lights.

I hope, however, that whether the Government arrest me or whether they stop by direct or indirect means the publication of the three journals, the public will remain unmoved. It is a matter of no pride or pleasure to me but one of humiliation that the Government refrain from arresting me for fear of an outbreak of universal violence and awful slaughter that any such outbreak must involve. It would be a sad commentary upon my preaching of, and upon the Congress and Khilafat pledge of, non-violence, if my incarceration was to be a signal for a storm all over the country. Surely, it would be a demonstration of India's unreadiness for a peaceful rebellion. It would be a triumph for the bureaucracy, and it would be almost a final proof of the correctness of the position taken up by the Moderate friends, *viz.*, that India can never be prepared for non-violent disobedience. I hope therefore that the Congress and Khilafat workers will strain every nerve and show that all the fears entertained by the Government and their supporters were totally wrong. I promise that such act of self-restraint will take us many a mile towards our triple goal.

There should therefore be no *hartals*, no noisy demonstrations, no processions. I would regard the observance of perfect peace on my arrest as a mark of high honour paid to me by my countrymen. What I would love to see, however, is the constructive work of the Congress going on with clock-work regularity and the speed of the Punjab Express. I would love to see people who have hitherto kept back, voluntarily discarding all their foreign

cloth and making a bonfire of it. Let them fulfil the whole of the constructive programme framed at Bardoli, and they will not only release me and other prisoners, but they will also inaugurate Swaraj and secure redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs. Let them remember the four pillars of Swaraj: Non-violence, Hindu-Moslem-Sikh-Parsi-Christian-Jew unity, total removal of untouchability and manufacture of hand-spun and hand-woven *khaddar* completely displacing foreign cloth.

I do not know that my removal from their midst will not be a benefit to the people. In the first instance, the superstition about the possession of supernatural powers by me will be demolished. Secondly, the belief that people have accepted the Non-co-operation programme only under my influence and that they have no independent faith in it will be disproved. Thirdly, our capacity for Swaraj will be proved by our ability to conduct our activities in spite of the withdrawal even of the originator of the current programme. Fourthly and selfishly, it will give me a quiet and physical rest, which perhaps I deserve.

PART IX

ARREST AND TRIAL

PART IX

ARREST AND TRIAL

15th March, 1922

ARREST AND AFTER

THE long expected has happened at last. The wished for, longed for consummation has been reached. Mr. Gandhi pined for his arrest and imprisonment by the Government under which it became intolerable for him to live. His heart's desire has been fulfilled. He now feels himself free, though imprisoned.

Even from the 8th instant the rumour of his arrest began to thicken. He left for Ajmere that day on an urgent invitation from Mr. Chhotani by an afternoon train, and it was even whispered that he might be arrested on the way. Nothing however happened then. In the meantime, the rumour was growing from hour to hour. A suspicious telegram from Ajmere made Mrs. Gandhi and some others to run up to the Sabarmati Station to see him safely return. He reached the *Ashram* in the afternoon of the 10th as free as ever and as if bursting under the weight of his simple, and child-like joy.

At the *Ashram* the rumour of the last two days was being received with calm and stolid indifference. For

there have been so many final partings since he had decided to start Civil Disobedience in November last that the ideas of arrest, imprisonment or even worse became quite common and familiar. So the daily routine of work of the *Ashram* was not disturbed in the least by these rumours. Only when the day wore on, the evening came and the bell rang out the hour of prayer, there was a sudden hush all around as all the *Ashramites* proceeded with anxious and hasty steps to join their *Bapu* in his last prayer, perhaps for a long time to come. He was unusually light and happy and played with the children like one of their own spreading the contagion of his lightness and happiness all round.

After the prayer he returned to his work as usual and dictated replies to some correspondence. During this time, friends continued to come to see him from the city, bringing tit-bits of news all of which went to confirm the prevailing rumour.

Mr. Gandhi arose at about quarter to ten* for his last ablutions before retiring and the small assembly that had all this time surrounded him began to disperse. Mr. Banker who had come with Mr. Shvaib and Anasuyabai to confirm the strength of the rumour also departed at that time. A few minutes after, Mr. Shvaib returned with Anasuyabai and brought the news that Mr. Banker was arrested and that the S. P. was waiting on the road for Mr. Gandhi's arrest. The news spread in a minute throughout the *Ashram* quarters, and almost all the inmates, men, women

* Mr. Gandhi was arrested at 10-30 P.M. by Mr. Healey, the Superintendent of Police, Ahmadabad on a complaint in respect of four articles in *Young India*, namely, "Disaffection a Virtue," of 15th June 1921 and three others referred to elsewhere. Mr. Shvaib took up the editorship till Mr. C. Rajagopalachari who was appointed editor took charge.

and children, hastened to Mr. Gandhi to bid him farewell and have his blessings. At his desire, his favourite Gujarati hymn which describes the qualities of a true *vaishnava* was sung in chorus. After this, he accosted each one of the *Ashramites* in suitable terms, encouraged them all by his sprightliness and abundant joy and then prepared to surrender himself. While proceeding from his residence to the Police Officer on the road, he expressed himself several times that he felt very happy and gratified over the arrest.

Maulana Hasrat Mohani who travelled with Mr. Gandhi from Ajmere by the same train and stopped at Ahmedabad came to the *Ashram* just before the arrival of the Police Commissioner and when Mr. Gandhi had retired for his ablutions. Mr. Gandhi was supremely happy when he met the Maulana just before his arrest. They embraced each other with feelings of mutual esteem and regard. The Maulana seemed to have been deeply moved by this and assured Mr. Gandhi that he would give his whole-hearted support to the cause of non-violent Non-co-operation.

. Both Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Banker were taken to the Sabarmati Jail. Mrs. Gandhi with a small company of four or five was allowed to accompany them and see them lodged in their quarters, which consists of a row of eight rooms with an open verandah about 10 feet wide and a fairly large courtyard with a line of small trees in the middle. The two rooms given to them are furnished each with an iron cot, a matress, two sheets, a pillow, a blanket and a carpet. Light is provided in the evening. The doors of the rooms are made of wooden frames, the planks about six inches wide with thick iron bars fixed in them, the distance between two bars being a little over an inch. The whole place was scrupulously clean.

The next day they were produced before the trying Magistrate, Mr. Allan Brown, I.C.S., who held his court at the Commissioner's office, outside the city proper and under the shelter of the cantonment and easily accessible by rail from Sabarmati. The news was kept a secret. Yet a good many spectators who were permitted by the Magistrate attended the trial. Five witnesses consisting of the D. S. P. Mr. Healey, the Registrar of the Bombay High Court, Mr. Dinshaw Gharda, Mr. Chatfield, the District Magistrate of Ahmedabad, a Sub-Inspector and a C. I. D. subordinate of police were examined by the prosecutor on the Government side. There were two issues on which these evidences were taken and articles from "Young India" were read before the Court, *viz.*, (1) proving the editorship and (2) proving the intention of the articles. These were simple issues upon which several precious hours of the day were uselessly spent simply to keep up the forms of law. But it appeared to be unreasonable that so much time should be taken to prove a self-evident fact. There was also an air of artificiality or theatricality about the whole business. The dignity and aloofness maintained by the trying Magistrate even while taking down statement from his friends, colleagues and superiors had an element of acting which was admirably done; similarly the deference shown to the chair of justice, irrespective of the person who may occupy it for the time being. Perhaps these are matters of tradition which grow upon those whose daily duty is to practise them. But to a new observer they appear incongruous, out of place and unnatural, although dignified and invested with gravity and splendour.

23rd March, 1922

THE GREAT TRIAL

At the Circuit House at Shahi Bag, the trial of Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Banker commenced on Saturday noon, the 18th of March, before Mr. C. N. Broomsfield, I. C. S., District and Sessions Judge of Ahmedabad.

Sir J. T. Strangman with Rao Bahadur Girdharlal conducted the prosecution, while the accused were undefended. The Judge took his seat at 12 noon, and said there was a slight mistake in the charges framed, which he corrected. The charges were then read out by the Registrar, the offence being in three articles* published in the "Young India" of September 29, Dec. 15, of 1921 and February 23, 1922. The offending articles were then read out: first of them was, "Tampering with Loyalty"; the second, "The Puzzle and Its Solution"; and the last was "Shaking the Manes."

The Judge said the law required that the charge should not only be read out, but explained. In this case, it would not be necessary for him to say much by way of explanation. The charge in each case was that of bringing or attempting to bring into hatred or contempt or exciting or attempting to excite disaffection towards His Majesty's Government, established by law in British India. Both the accused were charged with the three offences under section 124 A, contained in the articles read out, written by Mr. Gandhi and printed by Mr. Banker. The words 'hatred and contempt' were words the meaning of which was sufficiently obvious. The word 'disaffection' was defined under the section, where

* The complaint in respect of the earlier article, "Disaffection, a Virtue," seems to have been dropped subsequently after enquiry by the Magistrate.

they were told that disaffection included disloyalty and feelings of enmity, and the word used in the section had also been interpreted by the High Court of Bombay in a reported case as meaning political alienation or discontent, a spirit of disloyalty to Government or existing authority. The charges having been read out, the Judge called upon the accused to plead to the charges. He asked Mr. Gandhi, whether he pleaded guilty or claimed to be tried.

Mr. Gandhi: I plead guilty to all the charges. I observe that the King's name has been omitted from the charge, and it has been properly omitted.

The Judge: Mr. Banker, do you plead guilty, or do you claim to be tried?

Mr. Banker. I plead guilty.

Sir J. Strangman then wanted the Judge to proceed with the trial fully; but the Judge said he did not agree with what had been said by the Counsel. The Judge said that from the time he knew he was going to try the case, he had thought over the question of sentence, and he was prepared to hear anything that the Counsel might have to say, or Mr. Gandhi wished to say, on the sentence. He honestly did not believe that the mere recording of evidence in the trial which Counsel had called for would make no (sic) difference to them, one way or the other. He, therefore, proposed to accept the pleas.

Mr. Gandhi smiled at this decision.

The Judge said nothing further remained but to pass sentence and before doing so, he liked to hear Sir J. T. Strangman. He was entitled to base his general remarks on the charges against the accused and on their pleas.

Sir J. T. Strangman: It will be difficult to do so. I

ask the Court that the whole matter may be properly considered. If I stated what has happened before the Committing Magistrate, then I can show that there are many things which are material to the question of the sentence.

The first point, he said, he wanted to make out, was that the matter which formed the subject of the present charges formed a part of the campaign to spread disaffection openly and systematically to render Government impossible and to overthrow it. The earliest article that was put in from "Young India" was dated 25th May, 1921, which said that it was the duty of a Non-co-operator to create disaffection towards the Government. The counsel then read out portions of articles written by Mr. Gandhi in the "Young India."

Court said, nevertheless, it seemed to it that the court could accept plea, on the materials of which the sentence had to be based.

Sir. J. Strangman said the question of sentence was entirely for the Court to decide. The Court was always entitled to deal in a more general manner in regard to the question of the sentence, than the particular matter resulting in the conviction. He asked leave to refer to articles before the court, and what result might have been produced, if the trial had proceeded in order to ascertain what the facts were. He was not going into any matter which involved dispute.

The Judge said there was not the least objection.

Sir J. Strangman said he wanted to show that these articles were not isolated. They formed part of an organised compaign, but so far as "Young India" was concerned, they would show that from the year 1921. The Counsel then read out extracts from the paper, dated June 8, on the duty of a non-co-operator, which

was to preach disaffection towards the existing government and preparing the country for Civil Disobedience. Then in the same number, there was an article on disobedience. Then in the same number there was an article on "Disaffection—a virtue" or something to that effect. Then there was an article on the 28th of July 1921, in which it was stated that "we have to destroy the system". Again, on September 30, 1921, there was an article headed, "Punjab Prosecutions", where it was stated that a non-co-operator worth his name should preach disaffection. That was all so far as "Young India" was concerned. They were earlier in date than the article, "Tampering with Loyalty", and it was referred to the Governor of Bombay. Continuing, he said the accused was a man of high educational qualifications and evidently from his writings a recognised leader. The harm that was likely to be caused was considerable. They were the writings of an educated man, and not the writings of an obscure man, and the Court must consider to what the results of a campaign of the nature disclosed in the writings must inevitably lead. They had examples before them in the last few months. He referred to the occurrences in Bombay last November and Chauri Chaura, leading to murder and destruction of property, involving many people in misery and misfortune. It was true that in the course of those articles they would find Non-violence was insisted upon as an item of the campaign and as an item of the creed. But what was the use of preaching Non-violence when he preached disaffection towards Government or openly instigated others to overthrow it? The answer to that question appeared to him to come from Chauri Chaura, Madras and Bombay. These were circumstances which he asked the court to take into account in sentencing the accused, and it would be

for the Court to consider those circumstances which involve sentences of severity.

As regards the second accused, his offence was lesser. He did the publication and he did not write. His offence nevertheless was a serious one. His instructions were that he was a man of means and he asked the Court to impose a substantial fine in addition to such term of imprisonment as might be inflicted upon. He quoted Section 10 of the Press Act as bearing on the question of fine. When making a fresh declaration, he said a deposit of Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 10,000 was asked in many cases.

Court: Mr. Gandhi, do you wish to make a statement on the question of sentence?

Mr. Gandhi: I would like to make a statement.

Court: Could you give me in writing to put it on record?

Mr. Gandhi: I shall give it as soon as I finish it reading.

Before reading his written statement, Mr. Gandhi spoke a few words as introductory remarks to the whole statement. He said:

Before I read this statement, I would like to state that I entirely endorse the learned Advocate-General's remarks in connection with my humble self. I think that he was entirely fair to me in all the statements that he has made, because it is very true and I have no desire whatsoever to conceal from this court the fact that to preach disaffection towards the existing system of Government has become almost a passion with me, and the learned Advocate-General is also entirely in the right when he says that my preaching of disaffection did not commence with my connection with "Young India," but that it commenced much earlier;

and in the statement that I am about to read, it will be my painful duty to admit before this court that it commenced much earlier than the period stated by the Advocate-General. It is the most painful duty with me, but I have to discharge that duty knowing the responsibility that rests upon my shoulders, and I wish to endorse all the blame that the learned Advocate-General has thrown on my shoulders in connection with the Bombay occurrences, Madras occurrences and the Chauri Chaura occurrences. Thinking over these deeply and sleeping over them night after night, it is impossible for me to dissociate myself from the diabolical crimes of Chauri Chaura or the mad outrages of Bombay. He is quite right when he says that as a man of responsibility, a man having received a fair share of education, having had a fair share of experience of this world, I should have known the consequences of every one of my acts. I knew that I was playing with fire. I ran the risk, and if I was set free, I would still do the same. I have felt it this morning that I would have failed in my duty, if I did not say what I said here just now.

I wanted to avoid violence, I want to avoid violence. Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is also the last article of my creed. But I had to make my choice. I had either to submit to a system which I considered had done an irreparable harm to my country, or incur the risk of the mad fury of my people bursting forth, when they understood the truth from my lips. I know that my people have sometimes gone mad. I am deeply sorry for it and I am therefore here to submit not to a light penalty but to the highest penalty. I do not ask for mercy. I do not plead any extenuating act. I am here, therefore, to invite and cheerfully submit to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is

a deliberate crime and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course open to you, the Judge, is, as I am just going to say in my statement, either to resign your post, or inflict on me the severest penalty, if you believe that the system and law you are assisting to administer are good for the people. I do not expect that kind of conversion, but by the time I have finished with my statement, you will perhaps have a glimpse of what is raging within my breast to run this maddest risk which a sane man can run.

The Statement was then read out.

STATEMENT

"I owe it perhaps to the Indian public and to the public in England to placate which this prosecution is mainly taken up that I should explain why from a staunch loyalist and co-operator I have become an uncompromising disaffectionist and Non-co-operator. To the court too I should say why I plead guilty to the charge of promoting disaffection towards the Government established by law in India.

My public life began in 1893 in South Africa in troubled weather. My first contact with British authority in that country was not of a happy character. I discovered that as a man and an Indian I had no rights. More correctly, I discovered that I had no rights as a man, because I was an Indian.

But I was not baffled. I thought that this treatment of Indians was an excrescence upon a system that was intrinsically and mainly good. I gave the Government my voluntary and hearty co-operation, criticising it freely where I felt it was faulty but never wishing its destruction.

Consequently when the existence of the Empire was

threatened in 1899 by the Boer challenge, I offered my services to it, raised a volunteer ambulance corps and served at several actions that took place for the relief of Ladysmith. Similarly in 1906, at the time of the Zulu revolt, I raised a stretcher-bearer party and served till the end of the 'rebellion'. On both these occasions I received medals and was even mentioned in despatches. For my work in South Africa I was given by Lord Hardinge a Kaiser-i-Hind Gold Medal. When the war broke out in 1914 between England and Germany, I raised a volunteer ambulance corps in London consisting of the then resident Indians in London, chiefly students. Its work was acknowledged by the authorities to be valuable. Lastly, in India, when a special appeal was made at the War Conference in Delhi in 1918 by Lord Chelmsford for recruits, I struggled at the cost of my health to raise a corps in Kheda and the response was being made when the hostilities ceased and orders were received that no more recruits were wanted. In all these efforts at service I was actuated by the belief that it was possible by such services to gain a status of full equality in the Empire for my countrymen.

The first shock came in the shape of the Rowlatt Act, a law designed to rob the people of all real freedom. I felt called upon to lead an intensive agitation against it. Then followed the Punjab horrors beginning with the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh and culminating in crawling orders, public floggings and other indescribable humiliations. I discovered too that the plighted word of the Prime Minister to the Mussalmans of India regarding the integrity of Turkey and the holy places of Islam was not likely to be fulfilled. But in spite of the forebodings and the grave warnings of friends, at the Amritsar Congress in 1919, I fought for co-operation and working the

Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, hoping that the Prime Minister would redeem his promise to the Indian Mussalmans, that the Punjab wound would be healed and that the reforms, inadequate and unsatisfactory though they were, marked a new era of hope in the life of India.

But all that hope was shattered. The Khilafat promise was not to be redeemed. The Punjab crime was white-washed and most culprits went not only unpunished but remained in service and in some continued to draw pensions from the Indian revenue, and in some cases were even rewarded. I saw too that not only did the reforms not mark a change of heart, but they were only a method of further draining India of her wealth and of prolonging her servitude.

I came reluctantly to the conclusion that the British connection had made India more helpless than she ever was before, politically and economically. A disarmed India has no power of resistance against any aggressor if she wanted to engage in an armed conflict with him. So much is this the case that some of our best men consider that India must take generations before she can achieve the Dominion status. She has become so poor that she has little power of resisting famines. Before the British advent, India spun and wove in her millions of cottages just the supplement she needed for adding to her meagre agricultural resources. This cottage industry, so vital for India's existence, has been ruined by incredibly heartless and inhuman processes as described by English witnesses. Little do town-dwellers know how the semi-starved masses of India are slowly sinking to lifelessness. Little do they know that their miserable comfort represents the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter, that the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the

masses. Little do they realise that the Government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures can explain away the evidence that the skeletons in many villages present to the naked eye. I have no doubt whatsoever that both England and the town-dwellers of India will have to answer, if there is a God above, for this crime against humanity which is perhaps unequalled in history. The law itself in this country has been used to serve the foreign exploiter. My unbiassed examination of the Punjab Martial Law cases has led me to believe that at least ninety-five per cent of convictions were wholly bad. My experience of political cases in India leads me to the conclusion that in nine out of every ten the condemned men were totally innocent. Their crime consisted in the love of their country. In ninety-nine cases out of hundred justice has been denied to Indians as against Europeans in the Courts of India. This is not an exaggerated picture. It is the experience of almost every Indian who has had anything to do with such cases. In my opinion, the administration of the law is thus prostituted consciously or unconsciously for the benefit of the exploiter.

The greatest misfortune is that Englishmen and their Indian associates in the administration of the country do not know that they are engaged in the crime I have attempted to describe. I am satisfied that many Englishmen and Indian officials honestly believe that they are administering one of the best systems devised in the world and that India is making steady though slow progress. They do not know that a subtle but effective system of terrorism and an organised display of force on the one hand, and the deprivation of all powers of retaliation or self-defence on the other, have emascu-

lated the people and induced in them the habit of simulation. This awful habit has added to the ignorance and the self-deception of the administrators. Section 124-A under which I am happily charged is perhaps the prince among the political sections of the Indian Penal Code designed to suppress the liberty of the citizen. Affection cannot be manufactured or regulated by law. If one has no affection for a person or system, one should be free to give the fullest expression to his disaffection, so long as he does not contemplate, promote or incite to violence. But the section under which Mr. Banker and I are charged is one under which mere promotion of disaffection is a crime. I have studied some of the cases tried under it, and I know that some of the most loved of India's patriots have been convicted under it. I consider it a privilege, therefore, to be charged under that section. I have endeavoured to give in their briefest outline the reasons for my disaffection. I have no personal ill-will against any single administrator, much less can I have any disaffection towards the King's person. But I hold it to be a virtue to be disaffected towards a Government which in its totality has done more harm to India than any previous system. India is less manly under the British rule then she ever was before. Holding such a belief, I consider it to be a sin to have affection for the system. And it has been a precious privilege for me to be able to write what I have in the various articles, tendered in evidence against me.

In fact, I believe that I have rendered a service to India and England by showing in Non-co-operation the way out of the unnatural state in which both are living. In my humble opinion, Non-co-operation with evil is as much a duty as is co-operation with good. But in the

past, Non-co-operation has been deliberately expressed in violence to the evil doer. I am endeavouring to show to my countrymen that violent Non-co-operation only multiplies evil and that as evil can only be sustained by violence, withdrawal of support of evil requires complete abstention from violence. Non-violence implies voluntary submission to the penalty for Non-co-operation with evil. I am here, therefore, to invite and submit cheerfully to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course open to you, the Judge, is either to resign your post and thus dissociate yourself from evil, if you feel that the law you are called upon to administer is an evil and that in reality I am innocent; or to inflict on me the severest penalty if you believe that the system and the law you are assisting to administer are good for the people of this country and that my activity is therefore injurious to the public weal."

Mr. Banker: I only want to say that I had the privilege of printing these articles and I plead guilty to the charge. I have got nothing to say as regards the sentence.

THE JUDGMENT

The following is the full text of the judgment:

Mr. Gandhi, you have made my task easy in one way by pleading guilty to the charge. Nevertheless, what remains, namely, the determination of a just sentence, is perhaps as difficult a proposition as a judge in this country could have to face. The law is no respector of persons. Nevertheless, it will be impossible to ignore the fact that you are in a different category from any person I have ever tried or am likely to have to try. It would be impossible to ignore the fact that, in the eyes

of millions of your countrymen, you are a great patriot and a great leader. Even those who differ from you in politics look upon you as a man of high ideals and of noble and of even saintly life. I have to deal with you in one character only. It is not my duty and I do not presume to judge or criticise you in any other character. It is my duty to judge you as a man subject to the law, who by his own admission has broken the law and committed what to an ordinary man must appear to be grave offence against the State. I do not forget that you have consistently preached against violence and that you have on many occasions, as I am willing to believe, done much to prevent violence. But having regard to the nature of your political teaching and the nature of many of those to whom it was addressed, how you could have continued to believe that violence would not be the inevitable consequence, it passes my capacity to understand.

There are probably few people in India, who do not sincerely regret that you should have made it impossible for any government to leave you at liberty. But it is so. I am trying to balance what is due to you against what appears to me to be necessary in the interest of the public, and I propose in passing sentence to follow the precedent of a case in many respects similar to this case that was decided some twelve years ago, I mean the case against Bal Gangadhar Tilak under the same section. The sentence that was passed upon him as it finally stood was a sentence of simple imprisonment for six years. You will not consider it unreasonable, I think, that you should be classed with Mr. Tilak, *i.e.*, a sentence of two years simple imprisonment on each count of the charge; six years in all, which I feel it my duty to pass upon you, and I should like to say in doing

so that, if the course of events in India should make it possible for the Government to reduce the period and release you, no one will be better pleased than I.

The Judge to Mr. Banker: I assume you have been to a large extent under the influence of your chief. The sentence that I propose to pass upon you is simple imprisonment for six months on each of the first two counts, that is to say, simple imprisonment for one year and a fine of a thousand rupees on the third count, with six months simple imprisonment in default.

MR. GANDHI ON THE JUDGMENT

Mr. Gandhi said: I would say one word. Since you have done me the honour of recalling the trial of the late Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak, I just want to say that I consider it to be the proudest privilege and honour to be associated with his name. So far as the sentence itself is concerned, I certainly consider that it is as light as any judge would inflict on me, and so far as the whole proceedings are concerned, I must say that I could not have expected greater courtesy.

Then the friends of Mr. Gandhi crowded round him as the Judge left the court and fell at his feet. There was much sobbing on the part of both men and women. But all the while, Mr. Gandhi was smiling and cool and giving encouragement to everybody who came to him. Mr. Banker also was smiling and taking this in a light-hearted way. After all his friends had taken leave of him, Mr. Gandhi was taken out of the court to the Sabarmati Jail.

And thus the great trial finished.

16th March, 1922

TO HAKIMJI

The following letter has been addressed by Mr. Gandhi to Hakim Ajmal Khan:

SABARMATI JAIL, *12th March, 1922.*

My dear Hakimji,

Since my arrest this is the first letter I have commenced to write after having ascertained that under the Jail Rules I am entitled to write as many letters as I like as an under-trial prisoner. Of course you know that Mr. Shankerlal Banker is with me. I am happy that he is with me. Every one knows how near he has come to me—naturally, therefore, both of us are glad that we have been arrested together.

I write this to you in your capacity as Chairman of the Working Committee and, therefore, leader of both Hindus and Mussalmans or better still of all India.

I write to you also as one of the foremost leaders of Mussalmans, but above all I write this to you as an esteemed friend. I have had the privilege of knowing you since 1915. Our daily growing association has enabled me to prize your friendship as a treasure. A staunch Mussalman, you have shown in your own life what Hindu-Muslim unity means.

We all now realise, as we have never before realised, that without that unity we cannot attain our freedom, and I make bold to say that without that unity the Mussalmans of India cannot render the Khilafat all the aid they wish. Divided, we must ever remain slaves. This unity, therefore, cannot be a mere policy to be discarded when it does not suit us. We can discard it only when we are tired of Swaraj. Hindu-Muslim

unity must be our creed to last for all time and under all circumstances.

Nor must that unity be a menace to the minorities— the Parsees, the Christians, the Jews or the powerful Sikhs. If we seek to crush any of them, we shall some day want to fight each other.

I have been drawn so close to you chiefly because I know that you believe in Hindu-Muslim unity in the full sense of the term.

This unity in my opinion is unattainable without our adopting Non-violence as a firm policy. I call it a policy because it is limited to the preservation of that unity. But it follows that thirty crores of Hindus and Mussalmans, united not for a time but for all time, can defy all the powers of the world and should consider it a cowardly act to resort to violence in their dealings with the English administrators. We have hitherto feared them and their guns in our simplicity. The moment we realise our combined strength, we shall consider it unmanly to fear them and, therefore, ever to think of striking them. Hence am I anxious and impatient to persuade my countrymen to feel non-violent, not out of our weakness, but out of our strength. But you and I know that we have not yet evolved the non-violence of the strong. And we have not done so, because the Hindu-Muslim union has not gone much beyond the stage of policy. There is still too much mutual distrust and consequent fear. I am not disappointed. The progress we have made in that direction is indeed phenomenal. We seem to have covered in eighteen months' time the work of a generation. But infinitely more is necessary. Neither the classes nor the masses feel instinctively that our union is necessary as the breath of our nostrils.

For this consummation we must, it seems to me, rely

more upon quality than quantity. Given a sufficient number of Hindus and Mussalmans with almost a fanatical faith in everlasting friendship between the Hindus and the Mussalmans of India, we shall not be long before the unity permeates the masses. A few of us must first clearly understand that we can make no headway without accepting non-violence in thought, word and deed for the full realisation of our political ambition. I would, therefore, beseech you and the members of the Working Committee and the All-India Congress Committee to see that our ranks contain no workers who do not fully realise the essential truth I have endeavoured to place before you. A living faith cannot be manufactured by the rule of majority.

To me the visible symbol of all-India unity and, therefore, of the acceptance of Non-violence as an indispensable means for the realisation of our political ambition is undoubtedly the *charkha, i.e., khaddar*. Only those who believe in *cultivating* a non-violent spirit and eternal friendship between Hindus and Mussalmans will daily and religiously spin. Universal hand-spinning and the universal manufacture and use of hand-spun hand-woven *khaddar* will be a substantial, if not absolute proof of the real unity and non-violence. And it will be a recognition of a living kinship with the dumb masses. Nothing can possibly unify and revivify India as the acceptance by all India of the spinning wheel as a daily sacrament and the *khaddar* wear as a privilege and a duty.

Whilst, therefore, I am anxious that more title-holders should give up their titles, lawyers law-courts, scholars the Government schools or colleges, the Councillors the Councils and the soldiers and the civilians their posts, I would urge the nation to restrict its activity in this

direction only to the consolidation of the results already achieved and to trust its strength to command further abstentions from association with a system we are seeking to mend or end.

Moreover, the workers are too few. I would not waste a single worker to-day on destructive work, when we have such an enormous amount of constructive work. But, perhaps, the most conclusive argument against devoting further time to destructive propaganda is the fact that the spirit of intolerance which is a form of violence has never been so rampant as now. Co-operators are estranged from us; they fear us. They say that we are establishing a worse bureaucracy than the existing one. We must remove every cause for such anxiety. We must go out of our way to win them to our side. We must make Englishmen safe from all harm from our side. I should not have to labour the point, if it was clear to every one as it is to you and to me that our pledge of Non-violence implies utter humility and good-will, even towards our bitterest opponent. This necessary spirit will be automatically realised, if only India will devote her sole attention to the work of construction suggested by me.

I flatter myself with the belief that my imprisonment is quite enough for a long time to come. I believe in all humility that I have no ill-will against any one. Some of my friends would not have to be as non-violent as I am. But we contemplated the imprisonment of the most innocent. If I may be allowed that claim, it is clear that I should not be followed to prison by anybody at all. We do want to paralyse the Government considered as a system—not, however, by intimidation; but by the irresistible pressure of our innocence. In my opinion, it would be intimidation to fill the jails anyhow. And why should more innocent men seek imprisonment

till one considered to be the most innocent has been found inadequate for the purpose.

My caution against further courting of imprisonment does not mean that we are now to shirk imprisonment. If the Government will take away every *non-violent* non-co-operator, I should welcome it, but it should not be because of our Civil Disobedience, defensive or aggressive. Nor, I hope, will the country fret over those who are in jail. It will do them and the country good to serve the full term of their imprisonment. They can be fitly discharged before their time only by an act of the Swaraj Parliament. And I entertain an absolute conviction that universal adoption of *khaddar* is Swaraj.

I have refrained from mentioning untouchability. I am sure every good Hindu believes that it has got to go. Its removal is as necessary as the realisation of Hindu-Muslim unity.

I have placed before you a programme which is in my opinion the quickest and the best. No impatient Khilafatist can devise a better. May God give you health and wisdom to guide the country to her destined goal.

I am,
Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) M. K. GANDHI.

23rd March, 1922

HAKIMJI'S REPLY

The following is the reply sent by Hakim Ajmal Khan to Mahatma Gandhi's letter which was published in the "Young India" of 3rd March, 1922:

Ahmedabad, 17th March 1922.

My Dear Mahatmaji,

I have received the letter which you wrote to me from Sabarmati Jail and thank you very sincerely for the

kind sentiments that you have expressed towards me. Whether I really deserve them is another question into which I do not propose to enter.

I am glad that Mr. Shankerlal Banker is with you in the jail. He has great affection for you and possesses qualities which have endeared him to you. I feel sure that his company in jail will be a source of extra pleasure and satisfaction to you.

I can, however, feel happy at your arrest only when I find that, as a mark of the profound respect that it has for you, the country takes still greater interest in the national movement than it did when you were free. But it gives me infinite pleasure to see that the country observed perfect peace on your arrest. This is a clear sign of the spread of the spirit of Non-violence in the country, which is as essential for our success as pure air is for life.

I have no doubt that the secret of the progress of our country lies in the unity of the Hindus, the Mussalmans and other races of India. Such a unity should not be based on policy, for that, in my opinion, will only be a kind of armistice which might with difficulty be sufficient for present requirements. But I clearly see that the two great communities are coming closer to each other every day. And although the number of men whose hearts are absolutely free from any sectarian prejudices may not be very great in the two communities, I feel convinced that the country has found the road to real unity and will advance on it with steady steps towards its goal. So highly do I prize the unity of races inhabiting our country that, if the country gave up all other activities and achieved that alone, I would consider the Khilafat and the Swaraj questions automatically solved to our satisfaction. For the achievement of our objects is so

intimately connected with this unity that to me the two appear identical.

The question naturally arises, how are we to achieve this living and lasting unity ? I can find only one answer to that. We can only achieve it by the sincerity and purity of our hearts. Not until every one of us has driven selfishness out of his mind, will our country succeed in achieving its object. I know that the differences which have been created by a century of this system of Government cannot very soon be eradicated and, therefore, we cannot expect our efforts to bear fruit immediately. But there can be no doubt that we have accomplished the work of generations in months and have actually achieved what the pessimists among us considered impossible of achievement.

I do not consider the question of the Khilafat, in other words, the question of the evolution of Islamic policy, a passing phase. Just as in centuries past, it presented itself in one form or another, so will it in centuries to come. God alone knows how and when it will finally be solved. Therefore, even those who do not believe in Hindu-Muslim unity in the true sense of the term must understand that even as a policy it carries centuries under its arms. It is an admitted fact that looking to the present condition of India, next to Hindu-Muslim unity in importance is the question of Non-violence. How far have our efforts, or rather your efforts, been successful in that direction is shown by the progress of events. But the most striking proof of all of our success in that direction is afforded by our North-West Frontier Province where Non-violence had the least chance of success. When we find our brethren in that corner of India generally opposing the shield of Non-violence to the violent attacks of their opponents, we feel convinced

that the spirit of Non-violence has spread and is spreading satisfactorily in the country.

Doubts are entertained with regard to the United Provinces in this matter; but my own opinion is that in consequence of the dearth of national workers, the Congress creed has not been sufficiently explained to the people. I feel sure, however, the United Provinces will very soon come up to the level of other Provinces.

If some extraordinary or special causes have occasionally led to violence in some parts of the country, they should afford no ground for despair. We should not be unprepared for such stray cases, when we remember that we have been working with a limited number of workers in the midst of a population of 33 crores and working for eighteen months only. At the same time we should not minimise the significance of such occurrences and concentrate all our efforts on preventing their recurrence. Unity of the races inhabiting India and Non-violence are the two essential conditions for the success of the present movement.

Khaddar, too, no doubt is of invaluable help to us in the achievement of our objects. It will demonstrate our unity and show us how far we have advanced towards Swaraj. I do not think that picketing is so necessary for popularising *khaddar* as the country considers it to be. The country considers it a short cut and spends its limited time over it, although as you yourself have observed, the real work lies in creating in the minds of our people love for home-made things. But so far, I think, our Congress Committees have not sufficiently devoted their time and attention to it. This is the reason why they want to make up for this neglect by adopting the comparatively easier method of picketing. I, however, hope that in future the various Congress Committees would adopt

as their ideal to persuade people to use hand-spun and hand-woven *khaddar* and prefer it to picketing.

You have also touched upon the question of untouchability in your letter. On the face of it, it might appear to be a communal question. It is really a national question, for, the country as a whole cannot progress until and unless its component parts progress too. It is the duty of every person who has the interest of the country at heart to interest himself in all such questions as affect our national growth. Consequently, everything which comes in the way of the material or moral progress of the country must engage our attention. It is, therefore, as much a Muslim question as Hindu. Similarly, if the Mussalmans are backward in education, every good Hindu should think of their educational advancement, for every step in that direction is a step towards the educational advancement of the country as a whole, even though it may superficially appear to be to the advantage of one community only. I hope, therefore, the country will pay to the question of untouchability the attention that it deserves.

Bardoli and Delhi resolutions invite the country to concentrate its efforts on the constructive programme laid down by you. I hold that if we were to start Civil Disobedience, we would not have the necessary atmosphere required for the success of the constructive programme. It is very difficult to find a *via media*. I trust the Working Committee will fully consider the question and adopt a proper and suitable course.

Now that we are starting constructive work, we should re-organise the Congress office to suit our requirements. We should divide the work and create separate departments for different works, each under a member of the Working Committee selected for the purpose.

In the end, I join you in your prayers and wish to assure you that, though my failing health will not enable me to be of very great service to my country, it will be my earnest endeavour to discharge my duties, until Mr. C. R. Das is once more amongst us. May God help us in the sacred work which you and the country have undertaken for truth and justice, and may your going to jail lead to the achievement of our triple goal.

Yours sincerely,
MOHAMMAD AJMAL KHAN.

MRS. GANDHI'S MESSAGE

My dear Countrymen and Countrywomen,

My dear husband has been sentenced to-day to six years simple imprisonment. While I cannot deny that this heavy sentence has to some extent told upon me, I have consoled myself with the thought that it is not beyond our powers to reduce that sentence and release him by our own exertions long before his term of imprisonment is over.

I have no doubt that, if India wakes up and seriously undertakes to carry out the constructive programme of the Congress, we shall succeed not only in releasing him, but also in solving to our satisfaction all the three issues for which we have been fighting and suffering for the last eighteen months or more.

The remedy, therefore, lies with us. If we fail, the fault will be ours. I, therefore, appeal to all men and women who feel for me and have regard for my husband to wholeheartedly concentrate on the constructive programme and make it a success.

Among all the items of the programme, he laid the greatest emphasis on the spinning wheel and *khaddar*. Our success in these will not only solve the economic problem of India in relation to the masses, but also free us from our political bondage. India's first answer, then, to Mr. Gandhi's conviction should be that :

(*a*) All men and women give up their foreign cloth and adopt *khaddar* and persuade others to do so.

(*b*) All women make it a religious duty to spin and produce yarn every day and persuade others to do so.

(*c*) All merchants cease trading in foreign piece-goods.

KASTURIBAI GANDHI.

PART X

APPENDICES

PART X

APPENDICES

[A]

SOME OBITER DICTA

THE following notes appeared in "Young India" on the dates specified against them :

Gandhi Cigarettes.—Of all the abuses to which my name has been put, I know nothing so humiliating to me as the deliberate association of my name with cigarettes. A friend has sent me a label purporting to bear my portrait. The cigarettes are called 'Mahatma Gandhi' cigarettes. Now I have a horror of smoking as I have of wines. Smoking I consider to be a vice. It deadens one's conscience and is often worse than drink, in that it acts imperceptibly. It is a habit which is difficult to get rid of when once it seizes hold of a person. It is an expensive vice. It fouls the breath, discolours the teeth and sometimes even causes cancer. It is an unclean habit. No man has received my permission to associate my name with cigarettes. I should feel thankful, if the unknown firm were to withdraw the labels from the market, or if the public would refuse to buy packets bearing such labels.—*13th January, 1921.*

Lokamanya and Non-co-operation.—The up-country

English papers in giving obituary notices about the late Lokamanya Tilak have attributed to him views against Non-co-operation. So far as we are aware, Mr. Tilak held very strong views on Non-co-operation. We know that he assured Maulana Shaukat Ali that, if the Mussalmans offered Non-co-operation, his party and the Hindus in general would certainly follow them. The deceased had no final views on the details of Non-co-operation including boycott of councils, but when Maulana Shaukat Ali with Mr. Gandhi visited him at Sirdar Graha before going to the Punjab, he said that, if the Mussalmans boycotted the Councils, he and his party would follow suit. It is therefore strange that views should be attributed to the deceased which he never held.—*11th August, 1920.*

Government Non-co-operation.—Mr. Gandhi wrote in reply to a correspondent regarding railways and telegraphs :

I am not myself banishing the personal use of these conveniences myself. I certainly do not expect the nation to discard their use, nor do I expect their disuse under Swaraj. But I do expect the nation under Swaraj not to believe, that these agencies necessarily advance our moral growth or are indispensable for our material progress. I would advise the nation to make a limited use of these agencies and not to be feverishly anxious to connect seven hundred fifty thousand villages of India by telegraph and railway. The nation, when it feels the glow of freedom, will realise that they were needed by our rulers more for our enslavement than for enlightenment. Progress is a lame woman. It can only come hopping. You cannot send it by wire or rail.

Therefore, if we believe in our programme, we must not

mind if the Government non-co-operate with us in every particular. I hear from Mr. Rajagopalachari and Agha Safdar that they are not permitted to send full telegrams. It is a surprise to me that they permit the transmission of any telegrams at all or let us travel or meet each other. Having made up my mind to expect the worst, nothing that the Government does in the shape of curbing our activity surprises or irritates me. It is struggling for its very existence, and I feel that I would have done much the same that this Government is doing if I was in its place. Probably I should do much worse. Why should we expect it to refrain from using the powers it has ? Only we must find the means of living and carrying on our Non-co-operation without its aid. We must keep our heads, even if inter-provincial communication is denied to us. Having got our programme, each province must be able to carry on its own activity. Indeed it may even be an advantage, for in the event of communication being cut off, we should be unaffected by reverses in other provinces.—*17th November,* 1921.

Slow but Sure.—If the luxury of wires be denied to us, we must manage with the post. If the postal communication be also stopped, we must use messengers. Friends travelling to and fro will oblige us. When the use of the railways is denied, we must use other methods of conveyance. No amount of slowness imposed from without can checkmate us if we are sure within. 'Rock of ages cleft for me, let me hide myself in thee' is a prayer common to all religions. If we can but throw ourselves into His lap as our only Help, we shall come out scatheless through every ordeal that the Government may subject us to. If nothing happens without His permitting, where is the difficulty in believing that he is

trying us even through this Government? I would take our complaints to Him and be angry with Him for so cruelly trying us. And He will soothe us and forgive us, if we will but trust Him. The way to stand erect before the tyrant is not to hate him, not to strike him, but to humble ourselves before God and cry out to Him in the hour of our agony.—*15th December, 1921.*

Is it a Breach?—Friends have suspected me of having committed a breach of the Congress resolution, in that I have appealed to the Moderates to co-operate with us in the liquor campaign and, especially, in that I have actually invited them to legislate for prohibition. A friend asks, 'Why should we seek the help of the councils which we have boycotted? Does it not mean a modification of your previous attitude?' I venture to say that it does not. There is all the difference between a challenge and a petition. If I had appealed out of our helplessness, it would have been a breach of the Congress resolution and a modification of my own attitude. But, in my opinion, I strengthen our position, when I invite the Moderates in gentle language to do their duty, and prove their claim to be popular representatives. I see nothing wrong in inviting the Moderates and the Government to co-operate with us in all we are doing. I see nothing wrong in appealing to the Moderates or even to the Government through their authorised channels, to help us in the Khilafat and the Punjab matters, or to shut up all the liquor-shops, or to dot every one of their schools with spinning-wheels or to recognise the force of public opinion and to prohibit by legislation the import of foreign cloth. For, if they succeed in doing these things, I would cease to think evil of the institution they adore or administer. In making my appeal, I have

shown them a way to partial reinstatement in public estimation, and have furnished myself and the country with a further effective cause, in the event of the failure of the appeal, to demonstrate the wooden nature of the system. I have appealed, not as myself a part of the system, but as an outsider.—*6th July, 1921.*

If Mussalmans or Hindus Secede.—If one of the big communities secede from the compact of Non-violence, I admit that it is most difficult, though certainly not impossible, for one party only to carry on the struggle. That party will need to have an invulnerable faith in the policy of Non-violence. But if one community does realise that India cannot gain Swaraj for generations through violent means, it can by its consistently non-violent, *i.e.*, loving, conduct bring round all the opposing parties to its side.

If both the parties reject me, I should keep my peace just as ever and most decidedly carry on my propaganda of Non-violence. I should then not be restricted as I am now. Then I should be enforcing my creed, as to-day I seem to be enforcing only the policy.—*9th March, 1922.*

Self-defence.—The Non-co-operator's pledge does not exclude the right of private self-defence. Non-co-operators are under prohibition as to political violence. Those, therefore, with whom Non-co-operation is not their final creed, are certainly free to defend themselves or their dependents and wards against their assailants. But they may not defend themselves against the police acting in discharge of their duties, whether assumed or authorised. Thus there was no right of self-defence under the pledge against Collectors who have, I hold, illegally belaboured volunteers.—*9th March, 1922.*

Party Organisations.—Replying to a letter in August 1919, of Mr. G. S. Arundale, Mr. Gandhi wrote:

"You suggest the desirability of unity. I think unity of goal we have. But parties we shall have—we may not find a common denominator for improvements. For some will want to go further than others. I see no harm in a wholesome variety. What I would rid ourselves of, is distrust of one another and imputation of motives. Our besetting sin is not our differences, but our littleness. We wrangle over words, we fight often for shadow and lose the substance. . . . It is not our differences that really matter. It is the meanness behind that is ugly."—*4th February, 1920.*

Freedom of Minorities.—Mahatma Gandhi incessantly emphasised the importance of safe-guarding the rights of the minorities. He wrote *inter alia* on 9th February, 1921, under the heading, "The Greatest Thing":

Shall we copy Dyerism and O'Dwyerism, even whilst we are condemning it? Let not our rock be violence and devilry. Our rock must be non-violence and godliness. Let us, workers, be clear as to what we are about. *Swaraj depends upon our ability to control all the forces of violence on our side.* Therefore, there is no Swaraj within one year, if there is violence on the part of the people.

We must then refrain from sitting *dhurna*, we must refrain from crying 'shame, shame' to any body, we must not use any coercion to persuade our people to adopt our way. We must guarantee to them the same freedom we claim for ourselves. We must not tamper with the masses. It is dangerous to make political use of factory labourers or the peasantry—not that we are not entitled to do so, but we are not ready for it. We

have neglected their political (as distinguished from literary) education all these long years. We have not got enough honest, intelligent, reliable, and brave workers to enable us to act upon these countrymen of ours.

Communal Representation.—We have absurdities enough in India in communal representation being demanded by other small groups, because the principle has been conceded in the case of Mahomedans. But when the cry for communal representation comes from Indians in Burma, the absurdity becomes criminal. We understand some Indians of Rangoon have pleaded for communal representation in the Burmese Council to be formed under the reforms. We do hope that the demand will be withdrawn before mischief is done. The Burman will have every right to resent any such separate treatment of Indian settlers there. We are in Burma as guests of the Burmese for their and our mutual good, not for the exploitation of the former. Their welfare should be our first consideration. As a friend correctly points out, the Indian demand would be like Gujratis or Marwaris claiming communal representation for themselves in the Bengal Council. Surely, Indians of Burma would have a right to enter the Burmese Council, only if they by force of ability and service can command the Burmese vote. We, who desire that nobody should set up claims in India which are against our interests, are bound to guard against desiring rights in Burma in conflict with the interests of the Burmans. And yet that is precisely what lies at the bottom of this demand for communal representation by Indian settlers. We, therefore, trust that wiser counsel will prevail and that we shall hear no more of communal representation for Indians in Burma.—*21st April, 1920.*

Lawyers and Volunteering.—In reply to Mr. Ramdas Chhokra, Bar-at-Law of Lyallpur, Mahatma Gandhi wrote:

Lawyers cannot become office-bearers. They could not become members of executive committees. But the Volunteers' pledge is for the purpose, among others, of nullifying the effect of the disbandment notices of the Government. In my opinion, a lawyer who conscientiously signs the pledge is sufficiently pure for the purpose of going to jail. And the very fact of his readiness to go to jail ensures suspension of practice for the period of imprisonment. Suspension contemplated by the Non-co-operation resolution is meant to last till Swaraj is attained, which a lawyer may not be able to brave, though he may not mind, by signing the pledge, the risk of loss of practice, should he have to go to jail. In the one case suspension is a certainty, in the other a possibility—very remote, if a large number took the pledge. The gain in lawyers signing the pledge is great. They show their open sympathy with the cause in a limited sense perhaps, and they definitely and in their own persons advance the cause of Swadeshi. I would give much to see the lawyers having the courage of discarding their totally unnecessary foreign cloth and foreign cut, and taking up the *khaddar* dress and thus identifying themselves with the wonderful manifestation of the mass spirit. All the cloth that is handspun and handwoven, whether wool, silk or cotton, is *khaddar*. But it is expected that no one will take to silk or woollen *khaddar*, except when it is required by climatic or other urgent considerations. The fashion certainly should be, as Dr. Ray says, to wear the coarse *khaddar*. Let me repeat what I have said before, the *khaddar* that is coarse to look at is like tussor silk soft to the touch, and protects the skin

much better than the soft-looking *khadi.—2nd February, 1922.*

A Threatened Infliction.—I have just heard that Mr. Painter, who has distinguished himself by his wanton provocation of the people of Dharwad, is to be promoted and inflicted upon Gujarat as Commissioner. An official, who in the public estimation has disgraced himself, earns rewards from the Government for meritorious service. I hope that Gujarat will mark in a suitable and special manner its disapproval of the insult sought to be offered by the Dharwad collector being imposed upon it. Gujarat will have, if the rumoured appointment is actually made, a unique opportunity of showing how such insult can be dealt with in a Non-co-operation spirit. We must distinguish between the man and the Commissioner. We must boycott the latter and render social service to the former. We must therefore permit him to receive all he may reasonably need as man for creature comforts, but if we have the people with us, the Commissioner Mr. Painter may not get a blade of grass for the upkeep of the dignity of his office. We must therefore inculcate among the people the habit of refusing *salaam* to him in virtue of office. They must not send any applications to him. They must not, whilst he is touring in the country, supply him with any convenience whatsoever. He must be made, in every dignified and peaceful manner, to feel that he is not wanted as an official in Gujarat. The municipalities containing Non-co-operators should refuse to recognise him as Commissioner in every way possible. If we have developed the spirit of real independence and manliness, we would refuse to put up with an official who has forfeited public opinion as Mr. Painter has.

What, for instance, would be said of us, if Col. Frank Johnson or Gen. Dyer were imposed upon us? We have to pass through certain rigid tests as proof of our capacity for self-government. One of them is refusal to submit to national insults. Indeed, if we had evolved that capacity sufficiently, I would expect even the employees, who would come under Mr. Painter's direct control, to resign by way of protest. We have such mortal fear of loss of livelihood, that the employees are the last to be expected to develop that sense of self-respect which is so necessary for national existence. But their reluctance will not materially interfere with attainment of Swaraj this year, if the general public is responsive enough. It is time for them to assert themselves individually as well as collectively. We must begin our battle with a disciplined and complete *hartal*, when that gentleman enters Ahmedabad if he does. And to that end, seeing that there is ample time, the Provincial Congress Committee should secure permission from the Working Committee for declaring a *hartal* all over Gujarat in the event of Mr. Painter being sent to Gujarat in any official capacity. If a *hartal* becomes necessary, I need hardly say that it must be completely voluntary. The labourers should participate after due notice and permission.—*8th September, 1921.*

Distress Warrants.—Inquiries are being made in several places as to what should be done in cases where fines are imposed and distress warrants issued for recovery. One finds a readiness to suffer imprisonment and assaults, but not loss of goods. The anomaly is at first sight difficult to understand, but it is really easy to appreciate. We are so much tied down to our goods and other possessions that, when no disgrace attaches to

imprisonment, we prefer the inconvenience to loss of property. But we must perceive that we will lose a winning game, if we are not prepared to sacrifice our earthly possessions as well as bodily ease for the sake of it. In an ill-managed state, a man with conscience pawns to it his goods, all other wealth, and his body and sets his conscience free. This struggle, therefore, can give us victory, only if we become indifferent to everything through which the state can press us into subjection to its will. We must be prepared, therefore, to let our goods and our land be taken away from us and rejoice over the dispossession even as we rejoice to-day over imprisonments. We must rest assured that the Government will be more quickly tired of selling our chattels than it is already of taking charge of our bodies. And if we are sure, as we must be of winning full Swaraj before long, we must have faith enough to know that all the land that can be taken away will return to us intact and the best part even of money. When Belgium was overrun by the Germans, the Belgians knew that they would return to their own lands so long as they retained the will to suffer for the restoration of their property. The late General Botha was a fugitive from his own rich possessions including hundreds of acres of land and finest cattle in South Africa. He did not count the cost, put up a fine fight and became virtually the crowned king of South Africa and had all his property returned to him with honour. We may not do less than the Boers and the Belgians, especially as ours is a struggle in which we are pledged to make all sacrifice and exact none. We must voluntarily, though temporarily, embrace poverty, if we will banish pauperism and pariahdom from the land. The sacrifice of the ease by a few of us is nothing compared to the reward which is

in store for us, *viz.*, the restoration of the honour and prosperity of this holy land.—*12th January, 1922.*

The Malaviyas.—The most remarkable feature in the remarkable Non-co-operation struggle is the fact that it has divided families. And of all such instances, none is so striking as the division in the Malaviya family. It furnishes, in my opinion, an object-lesson to India in toleration and Civil Disobedience. Pandit Malaviyaji's toleration is really beyond compare. I know that he is against seeking imprisonment. I know too, that if he believed in it, he is not the person to shirk it. I should not be surprised to find him, when the agony has reached white heat and when his faith in British justice is completely gone like mine, to be the foremost in seeking imprisonment. But whilst he is himself against the course of Civil Disobedience for the present, he has never interfered with the choice of even those who are nearest to him and over whom he has unquestioned authority by right of love and eldership. On the contrary, he has left even his own sons absolutely free to do as they please. To me the instance of Govind's Civil Disobedience is one to treasure. Panditji tried hard to wean that brave boy in his own gentle and sweet manner. Govind tried his very best to carry out what he knew to be his father's wish up to the last moment. He prayed for light. He was torn by conflict of duties. The arrests of the Nehrus proved too strong for the young man. And invoking the blessings of his great and great-hearted father, he decided to throw himself into the struggle, and the jails of India probably hold no more joyous heart than Govind Malaviya's. I make bold to say that he has by his act of Civil Disobedience proved as dutiful to his father as he has been dutiful to his

country. Govind's act is a pattern for our time in dutiful Civil Disobedience of children. There is, I am sure, no gulf between father and son. Probably Malaviyaji is prouder of his son Govind now than he was before the latter's decision to seek imprisonment. It is truthful acts like these which prove to me the religious nature of the struggle.—*12th January*, 1922.

The Police Conference.—The address delivered by Babu Purna Chandra Bishwas, Deputy Superintendent of Police, as President of the All-India Police Conference held some time back in Calcutta, has not drawn the same amount of public attention as its importance deserves. Purna Babu has lucidly stated the whole case for the police. There is no doubt about the unpopularity of the police in India, and the present outrageous acts of repression have probably added to it. But we must not forget that the police are mere instruments wielded by the Government. The President says:

> "Here in India, the laws are made by Government and the people are of opinion that the laws are made to rule them, to control their natural aspirations and not for their benefit. We maintain the dignity of these laws and enforce them. That is one reason why we are so very unpopular." Again—"With the inauguration of the Reforms Scheme, the people have begun to realise that it is the laws that are unpopular and not the police, and that our only fault is that we are to carry out these unpopular laws."

The idea of ruling the people, of dominating them, of controlling their natural aspirations, as the President says, runs through the whole system of bureaucratic organisation India. And as that work is done more directly through the agency of the police, it is interesting to read the confession of a distinguished member of that service on the matter:

> "When I speak of our unpopularity, I cannot refrain from uttering,

though unpleasant it may be, that our conduct rules and the attitude of our superiors rather accentuate our estrangement from the public. We cannot freely mix with them, independently invoke their hearty co-operation and sympathy, for which there is the greatest need for our duties; if we do so, we are, on flimsiest pretexts, looked upon with suspicion by superiors, even penalised and our promotions are stopped. I ask, comrades, who are responsible for this? I can at once say, we have absolutely no fault except that we belong to this unpopular department, and it is our superiors and conduct rules that widen this gulf."

But though the Government utilises the Indian police in this way, does it treat them any the better on that account? The ban of racial inferiority sists upon them as tightly as upon the general mass of the people, as the long list of their grievances will show. It is producing restlessness in the service, indications of which are not wanting. The President thus cautiously expresses it:

"What will be the effect, if the subordinate police refuse to obey the command of their superior officer for dispersing or firing on a riotous mob? You may laugh at the idea, I too know that such a thing is impossible or at least undesirable. But no one knows how things change. You must not forget that the people of the country are no longer afraid of jail, and this spirit has also been imbibed by the subordinate police."

Purna Babu had to pay for all this out-spokenness. He was summoned before Sir Henry Wheeler and ordered abruptly to join duty. But the delegates mildly remonstrated against the order, and Purna Babu was triumphantly brought back from his train and taken in a procession to the conference to finish the proceedings.—*26th January*, 1922.

The Appeal to Nature and History.—In reply to the Rev. G. H. Macfarlane who wrote a sarcastic letter to the

Mahatma about his achievements, Mr. Gandhi replied as follows:

The writer asks to know the accomplishments of the movement. It has brought about a tremendous awakening among the people. Whereas they had given up hand-spinning entirely, to-day thousands of homes are spinning hundreds of thousands of yards of yarn. Whereas handspun garments had gone out of use, to-day thousands of men and women are wearing *khaddar* which has resulted in driving away hunger from thousands of homes. The people know that Swaraj means their power over the purse, the law, the police, and the military. They know that there can be no peace till the Punjab wound is healed and the Khilafat wrong is redressed.

The nations have progressed both by evolution and revolution. The one is as necessary as the other. Death, which is an eternal verity, is revolution, as birth and after is slow and steady evolution. Death is as necessary for man's growth as life itself. God is the greatest Revolutionist the world has ever known or will know. He sends deluges. He sends storms where a moment ago there was calm. He levels down mountains which He builds with exquisite care and infinite patience. I do watch the sky and it fills me with awe and wonder. In the serene blue sky, both of India and England, I have seen clouds gathering and bursting with a fury which has struck me dumb. History is more a record of wonderful revolution than of so-called ordered progress—no history more so than the English. And I beg to inform the correspondent that I have seen people trudging slowly up mountains and have also seen men shooting up the air through great heights.

Swaraj is India's birthright. The British system has

balked her of it. India is struggling to regain her lost liberty, and in doing so she is trying not to repeat but to make new history. In the process she betrays a woeful desire to repeat it as in Bombay, Madras and Malegaon. Malabar is not to be mixed up with the movement. Independence necessarily means freedom to err. Lastly, I assure the writer and others who think like him that the movement is not one of ill-will, but of good will towards all. Time alone can prove the truth of it. The agony does not permit us to see the new birth concealed beneath it. Let us watch, wait, and pray.—*2nd February*, 1922.

Force vs. *Non-violence.*—Mr. Zacharias argues in the *Servant of India* that the Khilafat is based on force. The Khalifa is the earthly representative of Islam pledged to defend it even with the sword. And how can I, a believer in non-violence, fight to sustain an institution that is permitted to resort to physical force for its defence?

Mr. Zacharias is right in his description of the Khilafat. He is wrong in his estimate of the function of a votary of non-violence. A believer in non-violence is pledged not to resort to violence or physical force either directly or indirectly in defence of anything, but he is not precluded from helping men or institutions that are themselves not based on non-violence. If the reverse were the case, I would, for instance, be precluded from helping India to attain Swaraj, because the future Parliament of India under Swaraj, I know for certain, will be having some military and police forces, or to take a domestic illustration, I may not help a son to secure justice, because forsooth he is not a believer in non-violence.

Mr. Zacharias' proposition will reduce all commerce by a believer in non-violence to an impossibility. And there are not wanting men, who do believe that complete non-violence means complete cessation of all activity.

Not such, however, is my doctrine of non-violence. My business is to refrain from doing any violence myself, and to induce by persuasion and service as many of God's creatures as I can, to join me in the belief and practice. But I would be untrue to my faith, if I refused to assist in a just cause any men or measures that did not entirely coincide with the principle of non-violence. I would be promoting violence, if, finding the Mussalmans to be in the right, I did not assist them by means strictly non-violent against those who had treacherously plotted the destruction of the dignity of Islam. Even when both parties believe in violence, there is often such a thing as justice on one side or the other. A robbed man has justice on his side, even though he may lie preparing to regain the lost property by force. And it would be accounted as a triumph of non-violence, if the injured party could be persuaded to regain his property by methods of Satyagraha, *i.e.*, love or soul-force rather than a free fight.

Of course it is open to Mr. Zacharias to reject my claim as a devotee of non-violence, in view of all the limitations I have mentioned. I can only suggest to him that life is a very complex thing, and truth and non-violence present problems, which often defy analysis and judgment. One discovers truth and the method of applying the only legitimate means of vindicating it, *i.e.*, Satyagraha or soul-force, by patient endeavour and silent prayer. I can only assure friends that I spare no pains to grope my way to the right, and that humble but

constant endeavour and silent prayer are always my two trusty companions along the weary but beautiful path that all seekers must tread.—*1st June, 1921.*

British vs. *Other Governments.*—'Observer' in the *Times of India* asks me whether the British 'is not a better Government than the Mogul and the Maratha.' must dare to say, that the Mogul and the Maratha Governments were better than the British, in that the nation as a whole was not so emasculate or so impoverished as it is to-day. We were not the Pariahs of the Mogul or the Maratha Empire. We *are* Pariahs of the British Empire.—*22nd June, 1921.*

Cause of India's Decay.—A correspondent asks, 'Is it not true that the loss of Hindu Kingdoms is on account of the people having attained to the highest order of spirituality?' I do not think so. We know, as a matter of fact, that the Hindus have lost each time for want of spirituality, in other words, moral stamina. The Rajputs fought amongst themselves for trifles and lost India. Of personal bravery there was a great deal, but of real spirituality there was a great dearth at the time. Why did Ravana lose and Rama with his monkeys win if it was not for the latter's spirituality? Did not the Pandavas win because of their superior spirituality? We often confuse spiritual knowledge with spiritual attainment. Spirituality is not a matter of knowing scriptures and engaging in philosophical discussions. It is a matter of heart culture, of immeasurable strength. Fearlessness is the first requisite of spirituality. Cowards can never be moral.

The Root Cause.—The same correspondent further asks, 'Don't you think that the success of the present

foreign government is due to the oppression of the poor, the weak, of the so-called untouchables by the higher classes?' This oppression by us of our own kith and kin is certainly the root cause. It is a fall from spirituality. The curse of foreign domination and the attendant exploitation is the justest retribution meted out by God to us for our exploitation of a sixth of our own race and their studied degradation in the sacred name of religion. Hence is it that I have put the removal of untouchability as an indispensable condition of attainment of Swaraj. Slave-holders ourselves, we have no business to quarrel with our own slavery if we are not prepared unconditionally to enfranchise our own slaves. We must first cast out the beam of untouchability from our own eyes before we attempt to remove the mote from that of our 'masters'.—13*th October,* 1921.

An Essential Condition of Swaraj.—The following appeared *inter alia* in an article entitled *Thefts on Railways*:

Swaraj can be maintained, only where there is a majority of loyal and patriotic people to whom the good of the nation is paramount above all other considerations whatever including their personal profit. Swaraj means government by the many. Where the many are immoral or selfish, their government can spell anarchy and nothing else. I am in this movement, only as I believe that the many are good and true at the bottom but being cowardly and careless are ignorant of their inherent qualities, and that when once they have realised the power of goodness, they will begin to practise it and succeed in the attempt.—28*th July,* 1921.

Need for Simplicity.—In an article entitled, "The Distress in Puri," Mahatma Gandhi wrote *inter alia*:

In India, it must be held to be a crime to spend money on dinner and marriage parties, *tamashas* and other luxuries so long as millions of people are starving. We would not have a feast in a family if a member was about to die of starvation. If India is one family, we should have the same feeling as we would have in a private family.—*22nd December*, 1920.

How to Kill Swadeshi.—We are familiar with the official ban put upon the *Khadi* cap in various parts of India. In Bihar, I heard that a magistrate actually sent hawkers to sell foreign cloth. Mr. Painter of Dharwad fame has gone one better, and has issued an official circular in which he says:

'All officers subordinate to the Collector and District Magistrate are desired to take steps to make people realise, that in as much as India produces less than her population requires, a boycott of foreign cloth and its destruction or export must inevitably lead to a serious rise in prices, which may lead to a serious disorder and looting, and that these consequences will be the result, not of any action on the part of Government, but of Mr. Gandhi's campaign.'*

In two other paragraphs, means are indicated of combating the Swadeshi propaganda, *i.e.*, by holding meetings, and by dealers who are opposed to boycott attending the Collector's office at stated hours. The Madras Government have issued a still more pedantic circular. The meaning of these circulars is obvious. Pressure is to be put upon the dealers and others not to countenance boycott. The subordinate officials will

* It subsequently transpired that similar circulars had been issued throughout the country in pursuance of the Government of India's instructions in the matter.

take liberties which the authors of circulars may not even have contemplated. . . . The people have been purposely or ignorantly kept in the dark hitherto. They have been wrongly taught to believe that all the cloth needed cannot be manufactured in India's homes as of yore. They have been figuratively amputated, and then made to rely upon foreign or mill-made cloth. I wish the people concerned will give the only dignified answer possible to these circulars. They will forthwith burn or send out all their foreign cloth, and courageously make up their minds to spin and weave for their own requirements. It is incredibly easy for every one who is not an idler.—*15th September, 1921.*

For Employees.—A correspondent inquires, "Would you advise the servants of railway companies, European firms and others who do not want their servants to subscribe to national funds or wear *Khadi,* to resign in obedience to the Congress call?" I should have thought that such a question could not require solution at this almost the last stage in the struggle. The surprise to me is, that any person can still remain in an office where he cannot follow his religion or maintain self-respect. That hundreds of clerks find it impossible to leave their offices although they are prevented from wearing the life-giving *Khadi* or subscribing openly to national fund, shows the depth to which we have sunk. It did not require the stern lesson of Non-co-operation to learn the elements of self-respect. And yet, that is just what Non-co-operation has been doing all these months. I commend to every employee the example of the brave Vizagapatam medical students who would not leave their *Khadi* dress for the sake of being able to remain in their school.—*3rd November, 1921.*

Deferred Pay.—The Government have found no difficulty in stopping the deferred pay, as pensions are now-a-days called, of Mr. Vinayakrao Joshi of Dharwar for no other reason than that he has tried to serve his country: Whereas, Sir Michael O'Dwyer who never loses an opportunity of vilifying educated Indians and of insolently patronising the masses, as if they were little children always needing the attention and care of an elder, and General Dyer, who still believes that he performed a simple duty when he massacred the innocent men in Jallianwalla Bagh, continue to draw pensions. We are told that there are legal difficulties in stopping their pensions and that if the legal obstacle can be surmounted, it would be immoral to take away their pensions. Verily there is one law for an Indian, another for an Englishman; one law for a patriot, another for a persecutor. What is moral in the case of one is immoral in the case of the other! I congratulate Mr. Joshi on his spirited reply to the Government and on his patriotic courage in foregoing his pension, when it became a matter of choice between service of his country and retention of his pension. Mr. Joshi's sacrifice strengthens India's cause. His material loss is India's moral gain.

13th October, 1920

IN CONFIDENCE

I receive so many letters questioning me regarding celibacy and I hold such strong views upon it, that I may no longer, especially at this the most critical period of national life, withhold my views and results of my experience from the readers of "Young India."

The word in Sanskrit corresponding to celibacy is

Brahmacharya* and the latter means much more than celibacy. Brahmacharya means perfect control over all the senses and organs. For the perfect Brahmachari nothing is impossible. But it is an ideal state which is rarely realised. It is almost like Euclid's line which exists only in imagination, never capable of being physically drawn. It is never the less an important definition in Geometry yielding great result. So may a perfect Brahmachari exist only in imagination. But if we did not keep him constantly before our mind's eye, we should be like a rudderless ship. The nearer the approach to the imaginary state, the greater the perfection.

But for the time being, I propose to confine myself to Brahmacharya as in the sense of celibacy. I hold that a life of perfect continence in thought, speech and action is necessary for reaching spiritual perfection. And the nation that does not possess such men is the poorer for the worst. But my purpose is to plead for Brahmacharya as a temporary necessity in the present stage of national evolution.

We have more than an ordinary share of disease, famines and pauperism—even starvation among millions. We are being ground down under slavery in such a subtle manner that many of us refuse even to recognise it as such, and mistake our state as one of progressive freedom in spite of the triple curse of economic, mental and moral drain. The evergrowing military expenditure, and the injurious fiscal policy purposely designed to benefit Lancashire and other British interests, and the extravagant manner of running the various departments of the state constitute a tax on India which has deepened her poverty and reduced her capacity for withstanding

* For further details on the subject, see the Mahatma's *Guide to Health* and *Indian Home Rule.*

diseases. The manner of administration has, in Gokhale's words, 'stunted' national growth so much that the tallest of us have to bend. India was even made to crawl on her belly in Amritsar. The studied insult of the Punjab and the refusal to apologise for the insolent breach of the pledged word to Indian Mussalmans are the most recent examples of the moral drain. They hurt the very soul within us. The process of emasculation would be complete, if we submit to those two wrongs.

Is it right for us who know the situation to bring forth children in an atmosphere so debasing as I have described? We only multiply slaves and weaklings, if we continue the process of procreation whilst we feel and remain helpless, diseased and famine-stricken. Not till India has become a free nation, able to withstand avoidable starvation, well able to feed herself in times of famine, possessing the knowledge to deal with malaria, cholera, influenza and other epidemics, have we the right to bring forth progeny. I must not conceal from the reader the sorrow I feel, when I hear of births in this land. I must express that for years I have contemplated with satisfaction the prospect of suspending procreation by voluntary self-denial. India is to-day ill-equipped for taking care even of her present population, not because she is over-populated, but because she is forced to foreign domination whose creed is progressive exploitation of her resources.

How is the suspension of procreation to be brought about? Not by immoral and artificial checks that are resorted to in Europe, but by a life of discipline and self-control. Parents must teach their children the practice of Brahmacharya. According to the Hindu Shastras the lowest age at which boys may marry is 25. If the

mothers of India could be inclined to believe that it is sinful to train boys and girls for a married life, half the marriages of India will automatically stop. Nor need we believe the fetish of early puberty among girls, because of our hot climate. I have never known a grosser superstition than this of early puberty. I make bold to say that the climate has absolutely nothing to do with puberty. What does bring about untimely puberty is the mental and moral atmosphere surrounding our family life. Mothers and other relations make it a religious duty to teach innocent children that they are to be married when they reach a particular age. They are betrothed, when they are infants, are even babes in arms. The dress and the food of the children are also aids to stimulating passions. We dress our children like dolls, not for their but for our pleasure and vanity. I have brought up children by the score. And they have without difficulty taken to and delighted in any dress given to them. We provide them with all kinds of heating and stimulating foods. Our blind love takes no note of their capacity. The result undoubtedly is an early adolescence, and unmature progeny and an early grave. Parents furnish an object lesson which the children easily grasp. By reckless indulgence in their passions they serve for their children as models of unrestrained licence. Every untimely addition to the family is amid trumpets of joy, and feasting. The wonder is that we are not less restrained than we are, notwithstanding our surroundings. I have not a shadow of doubt that married people, if they wish well to the country and want to see India become a nation of strong and handsome, full-formed men and women, they would practise perfect self-restraint and cease to procreate for the time being. I tender this advice even to

the newly married. It is easier not to do a thing at all than to cease doing it, even as it is easier for a life abstainer to remain teetotaller than for a drunkard or even a temperate man to abstain. To remain erect is infinitely easier than to rise from a fall. It is wrong to say that continence can be safely preached only to the satiated. There is hardly any meaning, either, in preaching continence to an enfeebled person. And my point is that whether we are young or old, satiated, or not, it is our duty at the present moment to suspend bringing forth heirs to our slavery.

May I point out to parents that they ought not to fall into the argumentative trap of the rights of partners. Consent is required for indulgence, never for restraint, this is an obvious truth.

When we are engaged in a death grip with a powerful government, we shall need all the strength physical, material and moral and spiritual. We cannot gain it unless we husband the one thing which we must prize above everything else. Without this personal purity of life, we must remain a nation of slaves. Let us not deceive ourselves by imagining that, because we consider the system of government to be corrupt, Englishmen are to be despised as competitioners in a race for personal virtue. Without making any spiritual parade of the fundamental virtues, they practise them at least physically in an abundant measure. Among those who are engaged in the political life of the country, there are more celibates and spinsters than among us. Spinsters among us are practically unknown, except the nuns who leave no impression on the political life of the country. Whereas in Europe, thousands claim celibacy as a common virtue.

I now place before the readers a few simple rules

which are based on the experience not only of myself, but of many of my associates.

(1) Boys and girls should be brought up simply and naturally in the full belief that they are and can remain innocent.

(2) All should abstain from heating and stimulating foods, condiments such as chillies, fatty and concentrated foods such as fritters, sweets and fried substances.

(3) Husband and wife should occupy separate rooms and avoid privacy.

(4) Both body and mind should be constantly and healthily occupied.

(5) Early to bed and early to rise should be strictly observed.

(6) All unclean literature should be avoided. The antidote for unclean thoughts is clean thoughts.

(7) Theatres, cinemas, etc., which tend to stimulate passion should be shunned.

(8) Nocturnal dreams need not cause any anxiety. A cold bath every time for a fairly strong person is the finest preventive in such cases. It is wrong to say that an occasional indulgence is a safeguard against involuntary dreams.

(9) Above all, one must not consider continence even as between husband and wife to be so difficult as to be practically impossible. On the contrary, self-restraint must be considered to be the ordinary and natural practice of life.

(10) A heart-felt prayer everyday for purity makes one progressively pure.

22nd December, 1920

THE SIN OF SECRECY

One of the curses of India is often the sin of secrecy. For fear of an unknown consequence we talk in whispers. Nowhere has this secrecy oppressed me more than in Bengal. Everybody wishes to speak to you 'in private.' The spectacle of innocent youngmen looking around, before opening their lips, to see that no third party overhears their conversation has given me the greatest grief. Every stranger is suspected of belonging to the secret service. I have been warned to beware of strangers. The cup of my misery was filled, when I was told that the unknown student who presided at the students' meeting belonged to the secret service department. I could recall the names of at least two prominent leaders who are suspected in high Indian circles of being spies of the Government.

I feel thankful to God that for years past I have come to regard secrecy as a sin, more especially in politics. If we realised the presence of God as witness to all we say and do, we would not have anything to conceal from anybody on earth. For, we would not think unclean thoughts before our Maker, much less speak them. It is uncleanness that seeks secrecy and darkness. The tendency of human nature is to hide dirt, we do not want to see or touch dirty things: we want to put them out of sight. And so must it be with our speech. I would suggest that we should avoid even thinking thoughts we would hide from the world.

This desire for secrecy has bred cowardice amongst us and had made us dissemble our speech. The best and the quickest way of getting rid of this corroding and degrading Secret Service is for us to make a

final effort to think everything aloud, have no privileged conversation with any soul on earth and to cease to fear the spy. We must ignore his presence and treat everyone as a friend entitled to know all our thoughts and plans. I know that I have achieved most satisfactory results from evolving the boldest of my plans in broad daylight. I have never lost a minute's peace for having detectives by my side. The public may not know that I have been shadowed throughout my stay in India. That has not only not worried me, but I have even taken friendly services from these gentlemen: many have apologised for having to shadow me. As a rule what I have spoken in their presence has already been published to the world. The result is that now I do not even notice the presence of these men and I do not know that the Government is much the wiser for having watched my movements through its secret agency. My opinion is that these agents accompany me as a matter of form or routine. They certainly never bother me. I venture to make a present of my experience to every young man in Bengal and for that matter in India. No one need think that my public position, and not my openness, saves me from offensive attention. It is the simplest thing to see that moment you cease to dread the presence of the spy and therefore refuse to treat him as such, that moment his presence ceases to offend you. Soon the Government will feel ashamed to have its secret service department or, if it does not, the secret police will be sick of an occupation which serves no use.

Non-co-operation is essentially a cleansing process. It deals with causes rather than symptoms. The detective department is a symptom of the secrecy which is the cause. Removal of secrecy brings about the full disappearance of the secret service without further effort.

The Press Act is a symptom of the disease of cowardice. If we would boldly declare our intentions, the Press Act will die of inanition. The beginners will have to suffer for their so-called daring. I hear that the *Servant* of Calcutta has been served with a warning for its tenacity to take over an article from "Young India" condensing Mr. Rajgopalachari's admirable instructions to voters. I notice too that the most telling passages of my speech in Calcutta have been omitted by the Press, evidently for fear of the censor. I would far rather see a complete stoppage of a newspaper, if the editor cannot without fear of the consequence freely express his sentiments or publish those which he approves.

Non-co-operation, while it gladly avails itself of the assistance that may be rendered by the Press, is,—has to be—by its very nature independent of the Press. There can be no doubt that every thought we print is being printed on sufferance. As soon as its circulation takes effect, the Government, for the sake of its existence, will try to prohibit it. We may not expect this or any government to commit suicide. It must either reform or repress.

In the ordinary course, repression must precede reform under a despotic government such as ours. The stoppage of the circulation of potent ideas that may destroy the government or compel repentance, will be the least among the weapons in its repressive armoury. We must, therefore, devise methods of circulating our ideas unless and until the whole Press becomes fearless, defies consequences and publishes ideas, even when it is in disagreement with them, just for the purpose of securing its freedom. An editor with an original idea or an effective prescription for India's ills can easily write them out, a hundred hands can copy them, many more can read them out to thousands of listeners. I do hope,

therefore, that Non-co-operation editors, at any rate, wi… not refrain from expressing their thoughts for fear of the Press Act. They should regard it as sinful to keep their thoughts secret—a waste of energy to conduct a newspaper that cramps their thoughts. It is negation of one's calling for an editor to have to suppress his best thoughts.

[B]

15th June, 1921

THAT APOLOGY

The Ali Brothers' apology* still continues to tax people's minds. I continue to receive letters expostulating with me for having gone to the Viceroy at all. Some consider that I have bungled the whole affair, others blame the Brothers for having for once weakened, and that in deference to me. I know, that in a short while, the storm will blow over. For, in spite of all I have heard and read, I feel that I did the right thing in responding to the Viceroy's wish to know my views. It would have been wrong on my part to have waited for a formal written invitation from His Excellency. I feel, too, that I gave the best advice possible in the interests of Islam and India, when I asked the Brothers to make the statement issued by them. The Ali Brothers have showed humility and courage of a high order in making the statement. They have shown that they are capable of sacrificing their pride and their all for the sake of their faith and country. They have served the cause by

* The Ali Brothers, at the instance of Mahatma Gandhi, issued a statement repudiating any intention to incite people to violence in the speeches. See *infra* "Agreed Statement."

making the statement, as they would have injured it by declining to make it.

In spite of all that conviction in me, I am not surprised at the remonstrances I am receiving. They but show that the methods now being pursued are new, that the country will not surrender a tittle of its just demands, and for their satisfaction, it wishes to rely purely upon its own strength.

I give below the relevant parts of the strongest argument in condemnation of my advice and its acceptance by the Brothers. The letter, moreover, is written by one of the greatest among the Non-co-operators. It is not written for publication at all. But I know the writer will not mind my sharing it with the reader. For I have no doubt that he represents the sentiments of several thoughtful Non-co-operators. It is my humble duty to discuss the issues arising from the incident, and the implications of Non-co-operation. It is only by patient reasoning, that I hope to be able to demonstrate the truth, the beauty and the reasonableness of Non-co-operation. Here then are the extracts :

"The statement of the Brothers, taken by itself and read without reference to what has preceded and followed it, is a manly enough document. If in the heat of the moment they have said things which, they now find, may reasonably be taken to have a tendency to incite to violence, they have, in publishing their regret, taken the only honourable course open to public men of their position. I should also have been prepared to justify the undertaking they have given for the future, had that undertaking been addressed to those of their co-workers, who, unlike themselves, do not believe in the cult of violence in any circumstances whatever. But the general words 'public assurance and promise to all who may require it' cannot in the circumstances leave any one in doubt as to the particular party who did require such 'assurance and promise', and at whose bidding it was given. The Viceroy's speech has now made it perfectly clear, and we have the indisputable fact that the leader of the Non-co-ope-

ration movement has been treating with the Government, and has secured the suspension of the prosecution of the Brothers, by inducing them to give a public apology and an undertaking,

"In this view of the case,—and I fail to see what other view is possible—very serious questions affecting the whole movement arise for consideration. Indeed, it seems to me that the whole principle of Non-co-operation has been given away.

"I am not one of those who fight shy of the very name of Government, nor of those who look upon an eventual settlement with the Government as the only means of obtaining redress of our wrongs and establishing Swaraj. I believe in what you have constantly taught, viz., that the achievement of Swaraj rests entirely and solely with us. At the same time, I do not, nor so far as I am aware, do you exclude the possibility of a settlement with the Government under proper conditions. Such settlement, however, can only relate to principles, and can have nothing to do with the convenience or safety of individuals. In a body of co-workers, you cannot make distinctions between man and man, and the humblest of them is entitled to the same protection at the hands of the leaders as the most prominent. Scores, if not hundreds, of our men have willingly gone to gaol for using language far less strong than that indulged in by the Brothers. Some at least of these could easily have been saved by giving a similar apology and undertaking, and yet it never occurred to any one to advise them to do so. On the contrary, their action was applauded by the leaders and the whole of the Non-co-operationist press. The case, which more forcibly than any other comes to my mind at the moment, is that of Hamid Ahmad, who has recently been sentenced at Allahabad to transportation for life and forfeiture of property. Is there any reason why this man should not be saved? I find Maulana Mahomed Ali pays him a high tribute in his Bombay speech of the 30th May. What consolation this tribute will bring to Hamid Ahmad from a man, similarly situated, who has saved himself by an apology and an undertaking, I cannot say. Then there are so many others rotting in gaol who have committed no offence, and a great many more already picked out for the same fate. Is it enough for us to send them our good wishes from the safe positions we ourselves enjoy?

"The Viceroy in his speech has made it clear, that the only definite result of the several interviews you had with him, is the apology and the undertaking from the Brothers. You have also made it quite clear in your subsequent speeches, that our campaign is to go on unabated. It seems that no point involving any principle has been

settled, except what needed no negotiating on either side, viz., that there is to be no incitement to violence. I do not say that in this state of things there should have been no treating with the Government, though much can be said in support of that view. When it was found that the game had to be played out, it would have been quite legitimate for two such honourable adversaries as yourself and Lord Reading to agree to the rules of the game, so as to avoid foul play on either side. These rules would, of course, apply to all who took part in the game, and not to certain favoured individuals only. The most essential thing was to agree upon the weapons to be used. While certain local Governments profess to meet propaganda by propaganda, they are really using repression of the worst type. Many other similar points would, in my opinion, be proper subjects of discussion, even when no agreement could be arrived at on the main issue.

"I hope you will not misunderstand me. I yield to none in my admiration of the sacrifices made by the Brothers, and consider it a high privilege to have their personal friendship. What has been preying upon my mind for some time past is, that we, who are directly responsible for many of our workers going to gaol and suffering other hardships, are ourselves practically immune. For example, the Government could not possibly have devised any form of punishment which would cause some of us more pain and mental suffering, than sending innocent boys to gaol for distributing leaflets, while the author remained free. I think the time has come, when the leaders should welcome the opportunity to suffer, and stoutly decline all offers of escape. It is in this view of the case that I have taken exception to the action of the Ali Brothers. Personally love them."

The letter breathes nobility and courage. And those very qualities have led to a misapprehension of the situation. The unfortunate utterance of the Viceroy is responsible for the misunderstanding.

The apology of the Brothers is not made to the Government. It is addressed and tendered to friends, who drew their attention to their speeches. It was certainly not given 'at the bidding of the Viceroy.' I betray no confidence, when I say that it was not even suggested by him. As soon as I saw the speeches, I stated, in order to prove *bona fides* of the Brothers and the entirely

non-violent character of the Movement, that I would invite them to make a statement. There was no question of bargaining for their freedom. Having had my attention drawn to their speeches, I could not possibly allow them to go to gaol (if I could prevent it) *on the ground of proved incitement to violence.* I have given the same advice to all the accused, and told them that if their speeches were violent, they should certainly express regret. A non-co-operator could not do otherwise. Had the Brothers been charged before a Court of Law, I would have advised them to apologise to the Court for some of the passages in their speeches, which, in my opinion, were capable of being interpreted to mean incitement to violence. It is not enough for a non-co-operator not to mean violence; it is necessary that his speech must not be capable of a contrary interpretation by reasonable men. We must be above suspicion. The success of the Movement depends upon its retaining its absolute purity. I therefore suggest to the writer and to those who may think like him, that the whole principle of Non-co-operation has not only not been 'given away' as the writer contends, but its non-violent character has been completely vindicated by the Brothers' apology, and the case therefore greatly strengthened.

What, however, is galling to the writer, is that whilst the Brothers have remained free, the lesser lights are in prison for having spoken less strongly than they.

That very fact shows the real character of Non-co-operation. A Non-co-operator may not bargain for personal safety. It was open to me to bargain for the liberty of the others. *Then* I would have given away the whole case for Non-co-operation. I did not bargain even for the Brothers' liberty. I stated in the clearest terms, that no matter what the Government did, it would

be my duty on meeting the Brothers to advise them to make the statement to save their honour.

We must 'play the game,' whether the Government reciprocate or not. Indeed, I for one do not *expect* the Government to play the game. It was when I came to the conclusion that there was no honour about the Government that I non-co-operated. Lord Reading may wish, does wish to do right and justice. But he will not be permitted to. If the Government were honourable, they would have set free all the prisoners, as soon as they decided not to prosecute the Ali Brothers. If the Government were honourable, they would not have caught youths and put them in prison, whilst they left Pandit Motilal Nehru, the arch-offender, free. If the Government were honourable, they would not countenance bogus Leagues of Peace.* If the Government were honourable, they would have long ago repented for their heinous deeds, even as we have for every crime committed by our people in Amritsar, Kasur, Viramgam, Ahmedabad, and recently in Malegaon. I entertain no false hopes or misgivings about the Government. If the Government were to-morrow to arrest the Ali Brothers, I would still justify the apology. They have acted in the square, and we must all do likewise. Indeed, inasmuch as the Government are still arresting people for disaffection, they are arresting the Ali Brothers.

The writer is, again, not taking a correct view of Non-co-operation in thinking that Non-co-operators, who are in gaol, are less fortunate than we who are outside. For me, solitary confinement in a prison cell,

* *Amansabhas* or Leagues of Peace were established in the province under official pressure and influence to combat Non-co-operation, especially in the U. P.

without any breach on my part of the code of Non-co-operation, or private or public morals, will be freedom. For me, the whole of India is a prison, even as the master's house is to his slave. A slave, to be free, must continuously rise against his slavery, and be locked up in his master's cell for his rebellion. The cell-door is the door to freedom. I feel no pity for those who are suffering hardships in the goals of the Government. Innocence under an evil Government must ever rejoice on the scaffold. It was the easiest thing for the Brothers to have rejected my advice, and embraced the opportunity of joining their comrades in the gaols. I may inform the reader that when during the last stage of the South African struggle I was arrested, my wife and all friends heaved a sigh of relief. It was in the prisons of South Africa that I had leisure and peace from strife and struggle.

It is perhaps now clear, why the Non-co-operation prisoners may not make any statement to *gain their freedom.*

THE AGREED STATEMENT

The following appeared in "Young India" of 4th August 1921 :

His Excellency's attention has been directed, and notably by Mr. Gandhi, to various statements that have appeared, and to inferences that have been drawn in the public Press, relating to the conversations between His Excellency and Mr. Gandhi, concerning Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali, which in some respects do not correctly represent the purport of those Communications.

The interviews between the Viceroy and Mr. Gandhi resulted from a conversation between the Viceroy and Pandit Malaviya, relating to the conditions generally prevailing in India. His Excellency informed Pandit Malaviya of the Government's decision to commence criminal proceedings against Mr. Shaukat Ali for having made speeches inciting

to violence and the discussion turned upon the disturbances that might possibly ensue. Pandit Malaviya expressed the opinion that it would be of advantage for His Excellency to meet Mr. Gandhi. His Excellency replied that he would be glad to meet Mr. Gandhi and hear his views, if he applied for an interview. On the next day, Mr. Andrews saw His Excellency and suggested that he should see Mr. Gandhi. It should be observed that various important matters were discussed during these conversations and that the proposed interview between His Excellency and Mr. Gandhi was intended to have reference to the situation generally. His Excellency is, however, aware that Pandit Malaviya, in inviting Mr. Gandhi to Simla, did not refer to the contemplated proceedings against Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali.

In due course Mr. Gandhi came to Simla, at the request of Pandit Malaviya and Mr. Andrews, and asked for an interview, with His Excellency, which was immediately arranged. At the first interview, no mention was made of the proposed prosecutions. The conversation related to the causes of discontent in India. Upon the next occasion His Excellency stated that, according to the Government reports, responsible Non-co-operators had made speeches inciting to violence, contrary to the doctrine advocated by Mr. Gandhi. Mr. Gandhi repudiated incitements to violence on the part of any of the responsible Non-co-operators and said that, if he was satisfied that any of them had incited to violence, he would publicly repudiate them and their teachings, unless they withdrew their statements that amounted to incitement to violence. His Excellency mentioned the names of the Ali brothers and promised to show Mr. Gandhi passages in their speeches which, in his opinion, were calculated to incite to violence, and when the passages were actually read to Mr. Gandhi he admitted that they were capable of bearing the interpretation His Excellency put upon them. He, however, asserted that he was convinced that it was not intended by Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali to incite the audience to violence. Mr. Gandhi added that he would see them as soon as he left Simla and advise them to express publicly their regret for the unintentional incitement, contained in the passages. His Excellency, thereupon, asked whether, in view of the importance of the document, Mr. Gandhi would show him the draft of the statement he intended to advise Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali to publish.

It was at this stage the Viceroy said that it was proposed to institute criminal proceedings against Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr.

Mahomed Ali in respect of these passages and that, if Mr. Gandhi showed him the statement and it satisfied him from the standpoint of his Government, he would use his influence to prevent the institution of prosecution, for, the Viceroy said, the object of the Government would be attained if the making of speeches of a violent character was in future prevented. Mr. Gandhi readily agreed to show the statement. The draft statement was duly shown by Mr. Gandhi to His Excellency, who pointed out that the introduction of certain paragraphs gave the statement the appearance of a manifesto, including that of the religious creed of Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali. The Viceroy observed further that the statement was incomplete so far as it did not contain a promise to refrain in the future from speeches inciting to violence and added that after publication of the statement Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali could give any explanation by means of speeches, provided they did not infringe the law. Mr. Gandhi agreed to delete the paragraphs in question and to add a passage to cover promises of future conduct. His Excellency then informed Mr. Gandhi that if Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali signed the statement as then altered by Mr. Gandhi, with the addition of the promise as to the future conduct, steps would be taken to suspend the institution of proceedings and that no prosecution would take place so long as the promises given in the published statement were observed. The Government remained free to take up prosecutions for the past speeches. The Viceroy added that, on the event of the publication of the statement by Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali and of the Government refraining in consequence from the prosecutions, it would be necessary to issue a *communique* explaining the attitude of the Government. There was, however, no desire to bargain. Mr. Gandhi even said that, whether the prosecutions took place or not, he would be bound, after having shown the extracts to his friends for their own honour and that of the cause, to advise them to express publicly their regret.

During the whole discussion, His Excellency and Mr. Gandhi were actuated by the desire to prevent any untoward events that might result from the prosecutions, as also to prevent speeches inciting to violence. The Viceroy informed Mr. Gandhi that he might not be able to prevent the commencement of proceedings, if the statement was not published with the least possible delay. There was already much discussion of the speeches not only in India, but also in the United Kingdom. Mr. Gandhi agreed that the statement should be published without delay. Mr. Gandhi then left Simla and some days afterwards

telegraphed to His Excellency that Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali had signed the statement with immaterial alteration and sent it to the Press for publication. The alteration was as follows: For the passage in Mr. Gandhi's draft statement, "We desire to state that we never intended to incite to violence, but we recognise that certain passages in our speeches are capable of bearing the interpretation put upon them," Mr. Shaukat Ali and Mr. Mahomed Ali put, "We desire to state that we never intended to incite to violence, and we never imagined that any passages in our speeches were capable of bearing the interpretation put upon them, but we recognise the force of our friends' argument and interpretation."

After the publication of the statement, an official *communique* was issued by the Government. The terms of the *communique* were not actually settled until just before its issue and Mr. Gandhi never saw it although the substance of it, as already indicated, had been communicated to him. The main part of the interviews between His Excellency and Mr. Gandhi consisted of conversations which ranged over the various causes of discontent in India, including the Punjab disturbances, the Khilafat agitation, the Treaty of Sevres and the general condition of the people. Mr. Gandhi did not submit any scheme of Swaraj to His Excellency, nor was a scheme of Swaraj discussed at the interviews.

Commenting on the above "Agreed statement," Mahatma Gandhi wrote:

His Excellency, the Viceroy, has now issued a statement agreed between him and me regarding the interviews I had the honour of having with him. The statement sets forth all the details that the public need know. I do not propose to discuss it. In my opinion it makes it clear that the apology, as I have called the statement of regrets, initiated with me, that it was conceived before I ever knew of the impending prosecution for the speeches that were shown to me and that it was neither suggested nor made for fear of the prosecution of the Brothers, certainly not to avoid imprisonment.* It is my

* The Ali Brothers were arrested and prosecuted in the second week of September, 1921. The following appeared in *Young India* of 29th September *inter alia* in an appeal to the Muslims:

firm belief that the Brothers have rendered a great service to the cause by making the statement. I do not regret having given them the advice. I wish also to

---

Whilst the arrest of Maulanas Shaukat Ali and Mahomed Ali has touched every Indian heart, I know what it has meant to you. The brave brothers are staunch lovers of their country, but they are Mussalmans first and everything else afterwards. It must be so with every religiously-minded man. The brothers have for years past represented all that is best and noblest in Islam. No two Mussalmans have done more than they to raise the status of Islam in India. They have promoted the cause of the Khilafat as no two other Mussalmans of India have. For they have been true, and they dared to tell what they felt, even in their internment in Chhindwara. Their long internment did not demoralise or weaken them. They came out just as brave as they went in.

And since their release from internment, they have shown themselves true nationalists, and you have taken pride in their being so.

The Brothers have by their simplicity, humility and inexhaustible energy fired the imagination of the masses as no other Mussalman has.

All these qualities have endeared them to you. You regard them as your ideal men. You are, therefore, sorry of their separation from you. Many besides you miss their genial presence. For me, they had become inseparable. I seem to be without my arms. For anything connected with Mussalmans, Shaukat Ali was my guide and friend. He never once misled me. His judgment was sound and unerring in most cases. With the Brothers among us, I felt safe about Hindu-Muslim unity, the value of which they understood as few of us have.

But whilst we all miss them, we must not give way to grief or dejection. We must learn, each one of us, to stand alone. God only is our infallible and eternal guide.

To be dejected is not only not to have known the Brothers, but it is, if I may venture to say so, not to know what religion is.

For do we not learn in all religions, that the spirit of the dear ones abides with us even when they physically leave us? Not only is the spirit of the Brothers with us, but they are serving better by their suffering, than if they were in our midst giving us some of their own courage, hope and energy. The secret of Non-violence and Non-co-operation lies in our realising that it is through suffering that we are to attain our goal. What is the renunciation of titles, councils, law

place on record my appreciation of the willingness with which Lord Reading approached my request for the publication of an agreed statement. In the lengthy

---

courts and schools but a measure (very slight indeed) of suffering? That preliminary renunciation is a prelude to the larger suffering—the hardships of a gaol life and even the final consummation on the gallows, if need be. The more we suffer and the more of us suffer, the nearer we are to our cherished goal.

The earlier and the more clearly we recognise that it is not big meetings and demonstrations that would give us victory, but quiet suffering, the earlier and more certain will our victory be.

I have made your cause my own, because I believe it to be just. Khilafat, I have understood from your best men, is an ideal. You are not fighting to sustain any wrong or even misrule. You are backing the Turks, because they represent the gentlemen of Europe, and because the European and especially the English prejudice against them is due, not to the Turks being worse than others as men, but to their being Mussalmans and not assimilating the modern spirit of exploitation of weaker people and their lands. In fighting for the Turks, you are fighting to raise the dignity and the purity of your own faith.

You have naturally, therefore, chosen pure methods to attain your end. It cannot be denied, that both Mussalmans and Hindus have lost much in moral stamina. Both of us have become poor representatives of our respective faiths. Instead of each one of us becoming a true child of God, we expect others to live our religion and even to die for us. But we have now chosen a method that compels us to turn, each one of us, our face towards God. Non-co-operation presumes that our opponent with whom we non-co-operate resorts to methods which are as questionable as the purpose he seeks to fulfil by such methods. We shall therefore find favour in the sight of God only by choosing methods which are different in kind from those of our opponents. This is a big claim we have made for ourselves, and we can attain success within the short time appointed by us, only if our methods are in reality radically different from those of the Government.

Hence the foundation of our movement rests on complete non-violence, whereas violence is the final refuge of the Government. And as no energy can be created without resistance, our non-resistance to Government violence must bring the latter to a standstill. But our

correspondence that ensued between us for settling the form and the language of the statement, I did not observe on His Excellency's part any inclination to

---

non-violence to be true must be in word, thought and deed. It makes no difference that with you non-violence is an expedient. Whilst it lasts, you cannot consistently with your pledge harbour designs of violence. On the contrary we must have implicit faith in our programme of non-violence, which presupposes perfect accord between thought, word and deed. I would like every Mussalman to realise, whilst the occasion for anger is the greatest, that by non-violence alone can we gain complete victory even during this year.

Nor is non-violence a visionary programme. Just imagine what the united resolve of seven crores of Mussalmans (not to count the Hindus) must mean. Should we not have succeeded already, if all the titled men had given up their titles, all the lawyers had suspended their practice and all the students had left their schools and all had boycotted councils? But we must recognise, that with many of us the flesh has proved too weak. Seven crores are called Mussalmans and twenty, two crores are called Hindus, but only a few are true Mussalmans or true Hindus. Therefore, if we have not gained our objective, the cause lies within us. And if ours is, as we claim it is, a religious struggle, we dare not become impatient save with yourselves, not even with another.

The brothers, I am satisfied, are as innocent as I claim I am, of incitement to violence. Theirs, therefore, is a spotless offering. They have done all in their power for Islam and their country. Now, if the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs are not redressed and Swaraj is not established during this year, the fault will be yours and mine.

We must remain non-violent, but we must not be passive. We must repeat the formula of the Brothers regarding the duty of soldiers and invite imprisonment. We need not think that the struggle cannot go on without even the best of us. If it cannot, we are neither fit for Swaraj nor for redressing the Khilafat or the Punjab wrong. We must declare from a thousand platforms that it is sinful for any Mussalman or Hindu to serve the existing Government, whether as soldier or in any other capacity whatsoever.

Above all, we must concentrate on complete boycott of foreign cloth, whether British, Japanese, American, French or any other, and begin, if we have not already done so, to introduce spinning wheels

avoid mention of any relevant detail. On my part, I had informed him that I had no intention to hide anything whatsoever. The public, therefore, have a full statement from both sides.

The suffering must not be accompanied by any resentment against Government. On Pandit Motilal Nehru being arrested, Mr. Gandhi wrote *inter alia* in "Young India" of 8th December, under the heading, "Love, not Hate":

In the moment of our trial and our triumph let me declare my faith. I believe in loving my enemies. I believe in non-violence as the only remedy open to the Hindus, Mussalmans, Sikhs, Parsis, Christians and Jews of India. I believe in the power of suffering to melt the stoniest heart. The brunt of the battle must fall on the first three. The last named three are afraid of the combination of the first three. We must by our honest conduct demonstrate to them that they are our kinsmen. We must by our conduct demonstrate to every Englishman that he is as safe in the remotest corner of India, as he professes to feel behind the machine gun.

---

and handlooms in our homes and manufature all the cloth we need. This will be at once a test of our belief in non-violence for our country's freedom and for saving the Khilafat. It will be a test also of Hindu-Muslim unity, and it will be a universal test of our faith in our own programme. I repeat my conviction that we can achieve our full purpose within one month of a complete boycott of foreign cloth. For we are then in a position, having confidence in our ability to control forces of violence, to offer Civil Disobedience, if it is at all found necessary.

I can, therefore, find no balm for the deep wounds inflicted upon you by the Government other than non-violence, translated into action by boycott of foreign cloth and manufacture of cloth in our own homes.

Islam, Hinduism, Sikhism, Christianity, Zoroastrianism and Judaism—in fact, religion is on its trial. Either we believe in God and His righteousness, or we do not. My association with the noblest of Mussalmans has taught me to see that Islam has spread not by the power of the sword, but by the prayerful love of an unbroken line of its saints and fakirs. Warrant there is in Islam for drawing the sword; but the conditions laid down are so strict that they are not capable of being fulfilled by everybody. Where is the unerring general to order Jehad? Where is the suffering, the love and the purification that must precede the very idea of drawing the sword? Hindus are at least as much bound by similar restrictions as the Mussalmans of India. The Sikhs have their recent proud history to warn them against the use of force. We are too imperfect, too impure and too selfish, as yet, to resort to an armed conflict in the cause of God as Shaukat Ali would say. Will a purified India ever need to draw the sword? And it was the definite process of purification we commenced last year at Calcutta.*

Whilst we must not avoid arrest, we must not provoke it by giving unnecessary offence.

We must hold the Congress at any cost in spite of the arrest of every one of the leaders, unless the Government dissolve it by force. And if we are neither cowed down nor provoked to violence but are able to continue national work, we have certainly attained Swaraj. For no power on earth can stop the onward march of a peaceful, determined and godly people.

*Non-co-operation was first accepted by the Congress at Calcutta in September, 1920.

[C]

CONDUCT IN PRISON

Why Suffer?—Imprisonments are not courted with the object of embarrassing the Government, though as a matter of fact they do. They are courted for the sake of discipline and suffering. They are courted because we consider it to be wrong to be free under a government we hold to be wholly bad. No stone should be left unturned by us to make the Government realise that we are in no way amenable to its control. And no Government has yet tolerated such open defiance, however respectful it may be. It might safely therefore be said that, if we are yet outside the prison walls, the cause lies as much with us as with the Government. We are moving cautiously in our corporate capacity. We are still voluntarily obeying many of its laws. There was, for instance, nothing to prevent me from disregarding the Madras Government's order and courting arrest, but I avoided it. There is nothing to prevent me save my prudence or weakness from going without permission into the barracks and being arrested for trespass. I certainly believe the barracks to be the nation's property and not that of a government which I no longer recognise as representative of the people. Thus there is an apparent inconsistency between the statement on the one hand that it is painful to remain outside the prison walls under a bad Government and this deliberate avoidance, on the other hand, of arrest upon grounds which are not strictly moral, but largely expedient. We thus avoid imprisonment, because first we think that the nation is not ready for complete civil revolt, secondly we think that the atmosphere of voluntary obedience and non-

violence has not been firmly established, and thirdly we have not done any constructive, corporate work to inspire self-confidence. We, therefore, refrain from offering Civil Disobedience amounting to peaceful rebellion, but court imprisonment merely in the ordinary pursuit of programme and in defence of complete freedom of opinion and action, short of revolt.

Thus it is clear that our remaining outside the gaols of a bad government has to be justified upon very exceptional grounds, and that our Swaraj is attained when we are in gaol or when we have bent the Govenment to our will. Whether, therefore, the Government feel embarrassed or happy over our incarceration, the only safe and honourable place for us is the prison. And if this position be accepted, it follows that when imprisonment comes to us in the ordinary discharge of our duty, we must feel happy because we feel stronger, because we pay the price of due performance of duty. And if exhibition of real strength is the best propaganda, we must believe that every imprisonment strengthens the people and thus brings Swaraj nearer.—*3rd November, 1921.*

15th December, 1921

WORK IN GAOLS

An esteemed friend asks me whether now that the Government have provided an opportunity for hundreds to find themselves imprisoned and as thousands are responding, will it not be better for the prisoners to refuse to do any work* in the gaols at all? I am

*Mahatma Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of 17th November, 1921 :
As Non-co-operators we *must* work in the gaols, for we do not non-co-operate with gaols as such. We submit to the courts' discipline

afraid that the suggestion comes from a misapprehension of the moral position.. We are not out to abolish gaols as an institution. Even under Swaraj, we would have our gaols. Pure Civil Disobedience, therefore, must not be carried beyond the point of breaking the unmoral laws of the country. Breach of the laws to be civil assumes the strictest and willing obedience to the gaol discipline, because disobedience of a particular rule assumes a willing acceptance of the sanction provided for its breach. And immediately a person quarrels both with the rule and the sanction for its breach, he ceases to be civil and lends himself to the precipitation of chaos and anarchy. A civil resister is, if one may be permitted such a claim for him, a philanthropist and a friend of the state. An anarchist is an enemy of the state and is, therefore, a misanthrope. I have permitted myself to use the language of war, because the so-called constitutional method has become so utterly ineffective. But I hold the opinion firmly that Civil Disobedience is the purest type of constitutional agitation. Of course, it becomes degrading and despicable, if its civil, *i.e.*, non-violent character is a mere camouflage. If the honesty of non-violence be admitted, there is no warrant for condemnation even of the fiercest disobedience, because of the likelihood of its leading to violence. No big or

---

when we are dragged to the courts. Civil Disobedience by its very nature requires us to yield complete obedience to gaol regulations, for as civil resisters we *invite* imprisonment and, therefore, are bound to suffer the rigours of its discipline. But we can civilly resist such regulations as are not only irksome, or hard to bear, but are humiliating or specially designed to degrade Non-co-operators. Our self-respect demands willing obedience to gaol discipline. The same self-respect may require resistance to misbehaviour, euphemistically called discipline. For instance, we would refuse to draw lines with our noses, whether within or without gaols.

swift movement can be carried on without bold risks, and life will not be worth living, if it is not attended with large risks. Does not the history of the world show that there would have been no romance in life, if there had been no risks? It is the clearest proof of a degenerate atmosphere that one finds respectable people, leaders of society, raising their hands in horror and indignation at the slightest approach of danger or upon an outbreak of any violent commotion. We do want to drive out the beast in man, but we do not want on that account to emasculate him. And in the process of finding his own status, the beast in him is bound, now and again, to put up his ugly appearance. As I have often stated in these pages, what strikes me down is not the sight of blood under every conceivable circumstance. It is blood spilt by the Non-co-operator or his supporters in breach of his declared pledge, which paralyses me as I know it ought to paralyse every honest Non-co-operator.

Therefore, to revert to the original argument, as civil resisters, we are bound to guard against universal indiscipline. Gaol discipline must be submitted to, until gaol government itself becomes or is felt to be corrupt and immoral. But deprivation of comfort, imposition of restriction and such other inconveniences do not make gaol government corrupt. It becomes that, when prisoners are humiliated or treated with inhumanity as when they are kept in filthy dens or are given food unfit for human consumption. Indeed, I hope that the conduct of Non-co-operators in the gaol will be strictly correct, dignified and yet submissive. We must not regard gaolers and warders as our enemies, but as fellow human beings, not utterly devoid of the human touch. Our gentlemanly behaviour is bound to disarm all suspicion or

bitterness. I know that this path of discipline, on the one hand, and fierce defiance, on the other, is a very difficult path, but there is no royal road to Swaraj. The country has deliberately chosen the narrow and the straight path. Like a straight line, it is the shortest distance. But even as you require a steady and experienced hand to draw a straight line, so are steadiness of discipline and firmness of purpose absolutely necessary, if we are to walk along the chosen path with an unerring step.

I am painfully conscious of the fact that it is not going to be a bed of roses for any of the civil resisters. And my head reels and the heart throbs, when I recall the lives of Motilal Nehru and C. R. Das in their palatial rooms, surrounded by numerous willing attendants and by every comfort and convenience that money can buy, and when I think of what is in store for them inside the cold unattractive prison walls, where they will have to listen to the clanking of the prisoner's chains in the place of the sweet music of their drawing rooms. But I steel my heart with the thought that it is the sacrifice of just such heroes that will usher in Swaraj. The noblest of South Africans, Canadians, Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans have had to undergo much greater sacrifices than we have mapped out for ourselves.

29th December, 1921

A MODEL PRISONER

"Should Non-co-operators shout Bande Mataram inside jails against jail discipline which may excite ordinary prisoners to violence, should Non-co-operators go on hunger strike for the improvement of food or other conveniences, should they strike work

inside jails on *hartal* days and other days? Are Non-co-operators entitled to break rules of jail discipline unless they affect their conscience?" Such is the text of a telegram I received from a Non-co-operator friend in Calcutta. From another part of India when a friend, again a Non-co-operator, heard of the indiscipline of Non-co-operator prisoners, he asked me to write on the necessity of observing jail discipline. As against this, I know prisoners who are scrupulously observing in a becoming spirit all the discipline imposed upon them.

It is necessary, when thousands are going to jail, to understand exactly the position a Non-co-operator prisoner can take up consistently with his pledge of non-violence. Non-co-operation, when its limitations are not recognised, becomes a licence instead of being a duty and therefore becomes a crime. The dividing line between right and wrong is often so thin as to become indistinguishable. But it is a line that is breakable and unmistakable.

What is then the difference between those who find themselves in jails for being in the right and those who are there for being in the wrong? Both wear often the same dress, eat the same food and are subject outwardly to the same discipline. But whilst the latter submit to discipline most unwillingly and would commit a breach of it secretly, and even openly if they could, the former will willingly and to the best of their ability conform to the jail discipline and prove worthier and more serviceable to their cause than when they are outside. We have observed that the most distinguished among the prisoners are of greater service inside the jails than outside. The co-efficient of service is raised to the extent of the strictness with which jail discipline is observed.

Let it be remembered that we are not seeking to destroy jails as such. I fear that we shall have to maintain jails even under Swaraj. It will go hard with us, if we let the real criminals understand that they will be set free or be very much better treated when Swaraj is established. Even in reformatories by which I would like to replace every jail under Swaraj, discipline will be exacted. Therefore we really retard the advent of Swaraj if we encourage indiscipline. Indeed the swift programme of Swaraj has been conceived on the supposition that we being a cultured people are capable of evolving right discipline within a short time.

Indeed whilst on the one hand Civil Disobedience authorises disobedience of unjust laws or unmoral laws of a state which one seeks to overthrow, it requires meek and willing submission to the penalty of disobedience and therefore cheerful acceptance of the jail discipline and its attendant hardships.

It is now therefore clear that a civil resister's resistance ceases and his obedience is resumed as soon as he is under confinement. In confinement he claims no privileges because of the civility of his disobedience. Inside the jail by his exemplary conduct he reforms even the criminals surrounding him, he softens the hearts of jailors and others in authority. Such meek behaviour springing from strength and knowledge ultimately dissolves the tyranny of the tyrant. It is for this reason that I claim that voluntary suffering is the quickest and the best remedy for the removal of abuses and injustices.

It is now manifest that shouts of Bande Mataram or any other in breach of jail discipline are unlawful for a Non-co-operator to indulge in. It is equally unlawful for him to commit a stealthy breach of jail regulations.

Non-co-operator will do nothing to demoralise his

fellow prisoners. The only occasion when he can openly disobey jail regulations or hunger-strike is when an attempt is made to humiliate him or when the warders themselves break, as they often do, the rules for the comfort of prisoners or when food that is unfit for human consumption is issued as it often is.* A case for Civil Disobedience also arises when there is interference with any obligatory religious practice.

* *The Ali Brothers.*—I reproduce the following telegram received from Karachi by post, because it would not be sent by the authorities:

"Moulana Mohammad Ali reduced 25 lbs. in jail. Light at night not permitted to him though recommended by Magistrate and Medical Officer. Superintendent opposed to allowing this.

"Medical Officer recommended groundnuts or extract of cheese by way of food for Moulana Mohammad Ali on account of diabetes. Superintendent not disposed but after all provided groundnuts worth one anna per day and on Moulana's insistence raised it to two annas. This serves as his morning meal.

"Deviating from usual treatment Moulana Shaukat Ali, Doctor Kitchlew, Moulvi Nisar Ahmad, Pir Gulam Majdid all convicted at Karachi trial for conspiring to seduce Indian troops from their allegiance were asked on Saturday the 28th to submit to search of their person, a practice commonly followed in case of convicts. This consists in making the prisoners absolutely naked with the exception of a *langoti* made loose. The prisoners in this condition are asked to raise hands and open their mouths as though to show if there was anything hidden anywhere. This humiliation Moulana Shaukat Ali and his companions were saved so far. On Saturday 28th on being asked to submit to this they refused. On Monday the 30th their person was forcibly searched and as punishment for refusing voluntarily to submit to this indignity and humiliation the forenamed leaders have been confined to solitary cells for one month. In solitary cells prisoners are allowed insufficient bedding and that at night alone. Moulana Shaukat Ali and his companions thus forced to say their prayers on uncleaned ground contrary to their religious susceptibilities. Moulvi Nisar Ahmad was searched while offering his prayers.

"Moulana Mohammad Ali protests and demands like treatment.

"The leaders in jail ready to obey all Jail Rules except those that

[D]

ON PICKETING

The Indian Social Reformer contests the utility of picketing in its own vigorous style. Without entering upon any examination of its argument, I would perhaps

---

offend against their Religion or against their sense of honour and dignity as Indians or human beings.

" The jail authorities were up to the last moment asked by the leaders to refer the matter to Government but they refused to wait".

It is evident that instructions have gone forth that the policy of wise discretion is to give place to the policy of cast iron rigidity of enforcement of prison rules. Imagine Maulana Shaukat Ali or any of the high-spirited prisoners standing almost naked before the Jailor and in the presence of one another and submitting to what to them must be a most humiliating examination. I can understand the necessity and utility of such examination of confirmed criminals for whom alone the ordinary prison regulations are framed, but it is nothing short of lunacy to enforce obedience to such regulations on the part of men who apart from their political agitation have been regarded as orderly citizens and in some cases even as distinguished public men. To enforce some of the present regulations in respect of such prisoners is hopelessly to ignore the reality and to court trouble. Ordinary discipline must be exacted from the best of men when they happen to be in prison, more so when they court imprisonment. Discomfort of jail life they must expect and cannot grumble at. Respect for the jail officials must be exacted from them if they will not give it voluntarily and gracefully. Our discipline must not take the form of humiliation. Discomfort must not be torture, and respect must not take the form of crawling on one's belly. And therefore, on pain of being put in irons, in solitary confinement or of being shot, Non-co-operating prisoners must decline even in the name of discipline to stand naked before the jailor, must decline in the name of discomfort to wear stinking clothes or to eat food that is unclean or indigestible and must similarly decline even in the name of respect to open out their palms or to sit in a crouching position or to shout '*Sarkar Ek Hai*' or '*Sarkar Salam*' when a jail official is passing. And if the Government is now intent upon putting us through the fire in the jails and subject us to physical

take up less space if I simply state my view and experience. Picketing in its nature must be temporary, but it is like what a stimulant is in medicine. Drink is more

---

pains in order to bend us, we must respectfully decline to be humiliated and must fall back upon God to give us strength to withstand studied humiliation and to suffer physical tortures instead. Let the proud Brothers and their comrades purify the Karachi Jail.

But be the treatment what it may, the course before those who are put in prison is clear. We must not be irritated into taking a false or a hasty step. Our final salvation lies in the strictest adherence to our pledge. If we feel keenly, let us be still more non-violent, not less so; let us further concentrate on Civil Disobedience, let us lose no time in fulfilling the conditions necessary for Civil Disobedience. Let Hindus, Mussalmans and other races come still closer, let us rid ourselves of the remnants of foreign cloth still in our possession, let us bestir ourselves to manufacture more handspun *khadi*. Our progress depends upon calmly fulfilling the programme mapped out by ourselves, and not wasting a single minute in idle fretting and fuming. Let us not worry about the ill-treatment of those who are in jail. The Government have made no terms with us as to treatment. We have unconditionally surrendered our bodies to them even to be hacked to pieces without a quiver if God will give us the strength. We must not lose temper on any account.

Moulana Shaukat Ali's suggestions.—In the course of a letter dated 21st January, 1922, to his son, on the subject which was published in *Young India* of 22nd Feburary, 1922, Moulana Shaukat Ali suggested the following instructions to prisoners :

(1) They must be courteous to all especially to their fellow prisoners and Indian warders who are weak and helpless and made to do dirty work. We must lift them up and give them real courage and teach them patriotism and discipline. Along with this, we must have full confidence in ourselves and in our capacity for suffering.

(2) We must ask for clean food, clothing and bedding. But this is the least important thing in my opinion. The more important things come later.

(3) We must do as much work as we can easily accomplish without detriment to our health. If forced to do more than our strength or circumstances permit, we can readily retaliate by refusing to work, the

a disease than a vice. I know scores of men who would gladly leave off drink if they could. I know some who have asked that the temptation might be put away from

---

only weapon in our hands. It is a strong weapon and so has to be used carefully. This weapon can always bring the jail people to their senses, but it is not easy to wield it. We must cheerfully face the penalties and through suffering defeat them. Hunger-strike is another weapon; it is here weak and Moslims cannot use it. It only weakens our health while we must really get strong here, both physically and spiritually. *We must teach this Government both outside the jail and inside of it, that it cannot coerce or force us to do things against our wishes.* At the same time we must not shirk work or show that we are not capable of bearing hardships. There are some very humiliating practices which we *must* refuse to perform:

(*a*) Every evening all cloths are taken off and only in a little flim we show that we have not concealed anything in our loins.

(*b*) Jail parade, where you are made to do things which kill self-respect and in the name of discipline, humiliates you.

(*c*) Paying the call of nature with many people round about you and a warder watching you and so forth.

(*d*) *Azan* must be openly said by each 5 times daily at prayer time. They objected to my calling *Azan* but I smiled and told the Superintendent that he should never expect such a thing from me and should not even mention them. He kept quiet. The result is that now nearly four times more people say their prayers than before, and *Azan* the beautiful is heard in four places daily. Of course we must see that no violence is used. Tell our great chief that non-violence is maintained by prisoners also. They love and respect us and I think will obey us cheerfully. The Superintendent thinks that if all political prisoners were like me his life would be happy. I never complain, never ask for anything, and I am always laughing and singing."

Mahatma Gandhi commented on the above as follows:

I do not think that I need add anything to the letter by way of supplementary instructions. Besides laying down the instructions, it serves another useful purpose. It sets at rest all doubts as to the Brothers 'attitude. I know that they are not implacable. They are most reasonable but, thank God, they are also firm. They will yield not an inch out of *their* weakness. They will yield everything by

them. In spite of the temptation having been put away at their instance, I have known them to steal drink. I do not, therefore, think that it was wrong to have removed the temptation. Diseased persons have got to be helped against themselves.* If I have a son who is

* Mr. S. N. Ray of Benares wrote to *Young India* of 15th September asking Mr. Gandhi to explain why, while he disapproved of sitting *Dhurna*, he approved of picketing. He wrote with reference to Calcutta boys picketing the examination hall:

When the picketing party laid themselves flat before the gateway, they did so on the very argument that "diseased persons have got to be helped against themselves." As brothers who deemed themselves blessed in truly understanding your advice about modern education and in possessing boldness enough to leave their colleges, they thought it a duty incumbent upon them to dissuade their brothers from appearing at the examination. Lying flat on the ground is indisputably an oriental way of moral persuasion. It was nothing but humility preached in its real aspect. If I am truly inspired with the feeling that drinking is a dire vice and every one has to be saved from its clutches, shall I be deemed using physical force if I lie down in front of the drinking den and ask the intending drinker to trample over my body and get his drink? Here in this case I appeal to his heart. And by moral persuasion I understand appealing to the heart. By laying themselves in front of the Senate House, the Bengal pickets appealed to the heart of the examinees and certainly that was moral persuasion.

Mr. Gandhi replied as follows:

The writer assumes, without warrant, that I would countenance liquor-shop picketing of the type described in his letter. If the unseemly obstruction of the passage had been persisted in, there would have been a revulsion of feeling in the country, such as would have thoroughly discredited Non-co-operation. Moreover, it is a far-fetched analogy to compare the drink habit with education. In the matter of education, it is a conflict of ideals, and Non-co-operation is for this generation a new ideal. Whereas of drink the conflict is between

---

reason. Being God-fearing they are capable of entering into their opponents' real difficulties. Given perfect sincerity in the opponent and readiness to do right and acknowledge the wrong, no opponent need fear or distrust them. But to think of placating Mussalmans without placating the Brothers is to attempt to ignore Islam in India.

addicted (say) to gambling, and a gambling company imposes itself on me to tempt my boy, I have either violently to knock the company down or to post watches at its offices, in order, if possible, to shame my son into not going there. It is true that there are other gambling companies some distance from my place. Still I take it, I would be held in the right in having posted a watch at the company's door. I must make it difficult for my son to gamble. If the *Reformer* accepts the doctrine of state prohibition, it must accept the corollary of picketing, so long as the state is a tyranny being perpetrated in the face of public opinion. What, for instance, should the public do, if the state were to build palaces in every street for women of ill fame, and issue to them licences to ply their trade? Will it not be its duty, unless it destroys these palaces inhabited by vice, to quarantine them and warn the public of the danger of falling an easy prey to the temptation forced on it? I recognise the necessity of using only men and women of character as pickets and of guarding against violence being offered to those who insist on drinking in the face of public opinion. Picketing is a duty a citizen must discharge, when he is not helped by the state. What is a police patrol, if it is not picketing against thieves? The police use the gun, when the thief betrays an incli-

---

abstinence and a recognised vice. A young lad considers it a virtue to go to a Government college, a drinker knows drinking to be an evil habit. The educated youth reads newspapers, knows all the arguments for and against. Visitors to liquor-shops read nothing, and not being in the habit of attending meetings, hear nothing. Picketing, therefore, in the case of colleges and schools was not only superfluous, but in the manner it was carried out, constituted a sort of violence utterly unjustified in any event and for a Non-co-operator a breach of his pledge. I am glad, therefore, that the picketing stopped, if it did, as a result of my severe criticism.

nation to break into another's house. A picket uses the pressure of shame, *i.e.*, love, when he warns a weak brother against the dangers of the drink evil. The *Reformer* has attributed to picketing claims never put forth on its behalf.

22nd December, 1921

THE RIGHT OF PICKETING

The Government must have thought that Bombay having stopped picketing of liquor shops, all other places would necessarily follow suit. But Poona has shown that it is a right that cannot be abandoned without good cause. As soon as orders were issued to prohibit picketing, "we decided to break the orders," says Mr. Kelkar, "and this morning notice has been sent to the District Magistrate that we shall even to-day proceed to break the order, at a place and time specified. Myself, my son and Messrs. Bhopatkar, Gokhale, Paranjpye and about 16 others will form the first batch. Succession will, I am sure, be provided for by those who are left behind. Let us see how far Poona gives an account of itself in this matter." The party went, they were arrested, their names taken, and they were let off. Fresh parties have since been regularly going with the same result. Of course, Maharashtra will never lag behind in suffering. It possesses the hardest body of workers in India. It is remarkable how in every province the front rank leaders have run the boldest risks. But whilst Mr. Kelkar and his party had not the good fortune to be imprisoned, the Ajmer people fared better. On prohibition notices being issued, the workers regarding picketing as a 'religious right' took up the challenge. "Swaraj Sena volunteers

were posted," says Pandit Chand Karan Sarda, "on all liquor shops. The Government also posted its police force and mounted Sewars on each shop with orders to arrest the pickets. As soon as one batch was arrested, the reserve volunteers took their place. The police arrested only 17 volunteers who were summarily tried and sentenced to 4 months and 3 weeks rigorous imprisonment." They offered no defence. No more arrests seem to have been made at Ajmer. Where picketing can be practised without violence and ill-will against the liquor dealer or the drinker, it is a moral duty. That it has advanced the cause of temperance as nothing else has, no one can deny. Only the other day, at Karamsad, the Christian and Hindu Dhedhs gratefully informed me that as a result of picketing they had banished drink from their midst. Bombay has forfeited the right for the time being at any rate, because of its wanton and malicious destruction of Parsi liquor shops and its disgraceful behaviour towards Parsis and Christians on the fateful 17th November, and the two following days. I hope, however, that wherever picketing is practised, it will be entrusted to men or women of unimpeachable character, and carried on in the friendliest spirit. We do not want to make people virtuous by force.

23rd February, 1922

OUR LAXITY

A reliable correspondent writes to me saying that in Allahabad and Benares, the volunteers have been enlisted without regard to their qualifications.* Hardly

* The following appeared in *Young India* of 23rd February, 1922, under the heading "rather free than sober":

50 could be found dressed in handspun *khaddar* from top to toe. Some more could be found wearing *khaddar* for outer covering, all the rest being foreign cloth. The same correspondent says that some of the volunteers do not mind an occasional drink and that they are not tested as to their belief in non-violence and that in many instances the local Congress officials have lost control over them. It has been officially reported* that there are 96,000 volunteers enlisted in the United Provinces. If it is a fact that there are so many volunteers on the roll and that the vast majority of them do not conform to the Congress conditions, they are worse than useless. The complaints mentioned by me are formidable, yet as a matter of fact, I have not exhausted them all. The same news comes from Calcutta, again from a reliable source. My informant tells me that

Just as I am writing these notes, my assistant puts into my hand a cutting from the *Leader*, containing the text of Pandit Gopinath Kunzru's letter, describing in the calmest manner possible what befell him and his friend when they were purchasing in Agra brandy from a liquor shop for outward application for a patient. The volunteers would not allow them to take the brandy in spite of all the assurance of *bona fides* given by Pandit Kunzru. This is not only not non-violence but is unadulterated violence. Peaceful picketing does not mean that so long as no physical violence is used, any kind of pressure could be exercised. The volunteers, if they had remained true to their pledge, would have allowed safe passage to Pandit Gopinath and his friend. The picketers' duty is merely to warn drinkers against the vice of drink, not molest them or otherwise prevent them if they will not listen. If we may force temperance upon the people believing it to be good for them, the English administrators and their Indian supporters are certainly performing an analogous operation. They too force the present system on us well believing that it is good for us. If the Swaraj volunteers may, therefore, take such liberties as they have undoubtedly taken in respect of Pandit Gopinath Kunzru, they are seeking not to change the *system*, but the *masters*. I would rather have India to be free than sober if freedom has to be sold to buy sobriety.

hundreds who have gone to jail know nothing about the pledge,* are not dressed in *khaddar*, are not dressed even in Indian mill cloth but have gone to jail wearing foreign cloth, and that they have had no training in non-violence. A correspondent from Rohtak writes bitterly complaining that in many parts of that district the volunteers do not obey instructions and make the position of Congress officials most difficult and embarrassing.

If one-tenth of these complaints is true, I fear that we have not been able to cope with the wonderful awakening and to bring under control all the new additions to the Congress organisation. It is possible that it is nobody's fault that this is so. The Government precipitated a crisis by hurling the notifications about public meetings and volunteers at us. The challenge had to be and was taken up. New and inexperienced men

* The following about volunteer pledge, on the lines of which the Ahmedabad Congress also adopted a pledge, appeared in *Young India* of 22nd December, 1921 :

To show the thorough nature of the work of ensuring peace that is being done in Delhi, I extract the following remarkable pledge from Mr. Asaf Ali's letter which he wrote when he offered himself and fifty two others for arrest :

"With full consciousness of the omnipresence and omniscience of God I declare that it shall be my solemn duty (1) to attain Swaraj by peaceful means, (2) to preserve and foster unity between the members and followers of the various communities and religions of India, (3) to regard no class or community as contemptible or untouchable, (4) to sacrifice life and property for the honour and interests of my country, (5) to wear clothes made of cloth handspun and hand-woven in the country, (6) to obey without demur the orders of the officers, (7) so long as I am not discharged from the Corps, to observe myself and persuade others to observe non-violence (or as long as the Congress continues to follow this policy) and finally I will cheerfully bear privations and troubles which may confront me during my connection with the National Volunteer Corps and neither I nor any of my dependents and relations expect any compensation."

found themselves clothed with office and they were called upon to deal with a crisis which would have taxed to its utmost the capacity even of the experienced leaders withdrawn from public guidance.

There is much to be said in favour of this argument. No one need therefore be blamed, but we must not blink the facts. On the contrary, we must face them sternly, boldly and set our own house in order. No army in the world has yet marched to victory, which has not consisted of soldiers possessing the qualities of them. An army of peace has greater need to exhibit the qualities laid down for its soldiers. It would not do to retort that the standard is too high. A recruiting officer who takes recruits below the standard renders himself guilty of dishonesty, if he takes such recruits knowingly. All he can do is to report to the head-quarters that he cannot get recruits on the conditions prescribed, but on no account will he be justified in departing from them.

The conditions laid down by the Congress were read by myself in detail to the whole audience last December in the Congress pandal. They were exhaustively discussed by the All-India Congress Committee and the Working Committee, and then they were explained by me to the delegates and visitors from the different provinces at numerous informal discussions. The plea of impossibility of fulfilment cannot therefore be accepted. The delegates knew what they were about. They were nearly 6,000. They came to represent their respective constituencies and there should have been no difficulty about the fulfilment of the conditions.

I should personally be satisfied with 300 volunteers thoroughly understanding and complying with the conditions, but I should not care to lead a struggle with 30,000 volunteers who know nothing of and care less

about the conditions. The reason is obvious. In the one case I have at least 300 stalwarts to support me, in the other case I have to carry a burden of 30,000 men, not volunteers, who are a drag upon me. The 300 would help me, would obey instructions, but 30,000 will certainly not carry out instructions and may throttle me. We must therefore once for all make up our minds that all the resolutions which are passed by the Congress Working Committee have to be fulfilled literally. They are part of a swift and practical programme upon whose due fulfilment rests the future of India, the redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and the attainment of Swaraj. Resolutions by themselves mean nothing if they are not to be carried out in full. We used to complain when our resolutions, which were in days gone by addressed to the Government, were not carried out by it. Who is to complain when the resolutions voluntarily and deliberately passed by us are not carried out by ourselves? I, therefore, strongly advise all Congress and Khilafat organisations to see that they are strictly enforced in their respective jurisdictions. If they do not, it is they who will endanger the movement and no one else. It is for us to make or mar the future.

[E]

2nd February, 1922

POLITICAL AGENCIES

Repression is slowly spreading its net in all directions, and now-a-days precedes the Prince's visit as if to prove to the people the might His Royal Highness represents. As he is expected in Indore, Babus Badrilal Aryadutta and Chhotelal have been deported from Indore Camp by

the Agent to the Governor-General. Orders have also been issued prohibiting public meeetings within the Residency area. It may be that public life is not so well organised in these Residencies as in British India proper. But if it is, I have no doubt about the duty of the residents of the camp. If they can retain the non-violent spirit and if they are at all well organised, they should hold meetings notwithstanding the orders, and risk deportation or imprisonment. In my opinion, those who are deported should return to be arrested.

A similar story comes from Kathiawad. It seems that the Princes of Kathiawad have arranged Shikar parties and other non-political but expensive amusements for H. E. the Governor. The subjects of the States are angry, not over the Governor 's visit, but over the expensive amusements arranged in his honour. Probably the Governor does not even appreciate them. Why should these functionaries always want amusements? It is not as if they are without any, whilst they are working at headquarters. Indeed these amusements themselves must become a task for at least some of them. Neither party can be natural at these shows. They must put on their best behaviour and observe their respective distances. They must always act both officially and correctly even when they are meeting unofficially. In the circumstances, it would certainly save a great deal of time and expense if these amusements were cut down and the visits limited to State business only. Moreover, the Shikar parties offend vegetarian Kathiawad. The people of Kathiawad cannot but resent, even when they say nothing, the waste of animal life for no purpose whatsoever. I am told that, in order to draw the beasts of prey, goats have to be sacrificed for days in advance. Such Shikar, over which so much

innocent blood is spilt and is without any risk of life or limb on the part of the Shikari, is robbed of all charm and becomes a mild copy of the law that prevails between the Government and the people in India, whereby the public are always the sport of the Government which never runs any risk. It is not the Mosaic law of tooth for tooth, but it is the law of bullets against brickbats, life for a scratch. When the hunter runs no risk, it is not good sport but is downright cruelty. But the Agent to the Governor in Kathiawad evidently could not tolerate protest meetings even against the extravagance of the Princes and has therefore, it appears, prohibited public meetings and arrested Messrs. Munilal Kothari and Mansukhlal Ravjibhai Mehta.

All this activity in the Agencies is a new development. I congratulate those who are arrested. The law of non-violence is just as imperative in the Agencies and the States as it is in the pure British area. What is more, the residents in the States must not embarrass the latter in respect of or in the interest of the movement of Non-co-operation with the Government. They may fight against their local grievances but even then not in the intensive Non-co-operation manner except under very grave circumstances and except when public opinion is with them. In the States, the subjects cannot claim to have exhausted all their resources with the Princes themselves. They must form public opinion, carry on agitation and otherwise organise themselves. I often hear the talk that the Congress became useful only when Non-co-operation came in. This is an utterly wrong view of the situation. The Congress agitation paved the way for Non-co-operation. The latter was the fitting corollary to the previous Congress activities. The Congress has always been in India the greatest demonstra-

tive and effective agency for ventilating people's grievances. It has always been a true register of popular strength and weakness. The States subjects, too, must have their Congress and Conferences quite apart from the British Indian prototype and probably differently managed. They may learn from the mistakes of the parent body but they have to go through that preliminary discipline. A mere unexaggerated exposure of a wrong is by no means a small matter. Wrong like vice flourishes in secrecy. It dies of sunlight. Therefore let the subjects of States organise themselves quickly and in a methodical manner without mixing up and spoiling their local matters with the National Congress. The States subjects can work as so many are doing on the Congress and for the Congress outside the States area.

TOO SACRED FOR PUBLICATION

9th February, 1922

There are things one does not like to see published, not because there is anything secret about them but because they are too sacred for publication. Sometimes the published version gives an impression totally different from the spoken word, even though the reporting may be ever so accurate. When I call a little child a fiend in perfect good humour or with a frown, it would not do to report me as having called some one a fiend without giving long explanations as to the why and the how. Some such disservice has been done by the manifestly friendly reporter of a conversation and a discourse at Satyagraha Ashram as reported in the *Bombay Chronicle* of the 2nd instant. I dislike such things being reported. In a swift conversation

there are many things understood. An accurate report of such a conversation is impossible without copious footnotes. I am for instance reported as having said that Shantiniketan is for material progress and Satyagraha Ashram exists solely for spiritual progress. When the Poet sees this, he will either laugh at it if he remembers that I could not possibly say or mean any such thing about Shantiniketan, or he will be angry and despondent that even I should be so hopelessly ignorant and inartistic as not to see the spirituality of Shantiniketan. The Poet, I feel sure, is not likely to do me the injustice of thinking me capable of holding the belief imputed to me. I could say to the Poet, as indeed I have done, that Shantiniketan lacks discipline. He had laughed over it and even endorsed my criticism and justified it saying he was a Poet and Shantiniketan was for his amusement. He could only sing and make others sing. I was free to introduce all the discipline I liked but he was only a Poet. The reader must know that I have lived at Shantiniketan for more than once. I am permitted to regard it as a home of retreat. My boys have had shelter there and at the Gurukula when I was away in England. My conversation with the Hindi teacher was on the basis that both he and I were lovers of Shantiniketan. How can Shantiniketan be otherwise than spiritual when the author of pure spiritual poetry is the dominating spirit there? I am not so dull as to think that a place where Devendranath Tagore lived could be devoid of spirituality. The readers of *Young India* are aware that I receive spiritual draughts from Shantiniketan from time to time sent by Badadada* who is incessantly watching over me and praying for the success of my mission. I

* Dwijendranath Tagore.

hasten to inform the reader that I regard many professors and teachers of Shantiniketan as highly spiritual and good men whose association I have valued as a privilege. I must further inform the reader that I consider Bengal to be the most spiritual among our provinces. The whole of my conversation which is unfortunately reported was carried on in a humorous strain. I have often claimed among lovers of Shantiniketan greater spirituality for Satyagraha Ashram than Shantiniketan. But such competition and claim must not be interpreted into an assumption of superiority. I am most desirous to keep Satyagraha Ashram veiled from the public. We are there a band of humble unlettered workers knowing our own failings, trying to understand them still further and undoubtedly intent upon finding the truth and wanting to live and die for it. Comparisons between kindred, but not identical, institutions must never be made. But if a comparison must be made, in spite of the early rising and the discipline of Satyagraha Ashram, I would vote really and sincerely for Shantiniketan as an elder brother. It is older by far in age and I know it is so also in wisdom. But there is that 'but'. The inmates of Shantiniketan must beware of the race that the little place in Gujerat is running.

Having said so much of Shantiniketan by way of reparation, I have no time or space left for giving my version of the morning course nor must I attempt it. It came from the very pith of my soul. I could not report it myself with the same force. I heard a sister give it in one sentence. It was so true. I wish the unknown friend had never thought of reporting it. The report does not convey the central truth of it.

I HAVE LOST ALL CREDIT

23rd February, 1922

A friend from Lahore without giving his name sends me the following thundering note:

"On Tuesday the 14th I read the *Tribune* and the resolutions therein, passed at the emergency meeting of the All-India Congress Working Committee.* On Monday when I came from my office, I heard a flying rumour that Mahatmaji had postponed the date of the mass Civil Disobedience, but at that time I thought the news devoid of foundation. After a short time, a friend of mine hawked me at my house and we went to bazaar. His face was somewhat sadder than usual. I enquired of him the reason of his sadness. He said he was utterly disgusted and so gave up the idea of following this movement. Mahatmaji was going to give up the lead of this movement and at the same time he had advised all the Provincial Congress Committees not to enrol any more volunteers. No picketing propaganda should be undertaken as long as the special session of the All-India Congress Committee had not confirmed what to do further.

"The people are of this opinion that you have turned your face and become fickle-minded. They will co-operate with the Government without any hesitation and join the ceremony of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. Some say that they will not observe *hartal* and will accord a hearty reception at Lahore.

"Some merchants are under the impression that you have removed all the restrictions from all liquor shops and *videshi* cloth.

"Truly speaking, each and every one in Lahore city is holding meeting in the bazaar as well as in the house, and you will forgive me if I will say boldly that they are condemning the action of the All-India Congress Committee.

"I now for my sake ask you these questions.

"(1) Will you now give up the lead of this movement? If so, why?

"Will you be good enough to let me know why you have given such instructions to all Provincial Congress Committees? Have you given an opportunity to Pandit Malaviya for a Round Table Conference for a settlement, or has Pandit Malaviya agreed to embrace your movement in case the Government has not turned true to its words?

* Where the "Bardoli decision" suspending Civil Disobedience was arrived at.

"(3) Grant a compromise is arranged and the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs are redressed and in the case of Swaraj the Government may only extend the reforms, will you be satisfied with that or continue your activities till you have got the full dominion status?

"(4) Suppose no decision is arrived at. Will Pandit Malaviya and all others who are connected with this conference come to your side, or will their fate remain in the balance just as now?

"(5) In case no decision is arrived at, will you give up the idea of Civil Disobedience, if there is danger of violence?

"(6) Is your intention now to disband the present volunteer corps and enlist those who know spinning and wear handspun and handwoven *khaddar*?

"(7) Suppose violence has made appearance when you have started your mass Civil Disobedience, what will you do at that time? Will you stop your activities at the very moment?"

There is much more criticism in this letter than I have reproduced. The writer tells me that the people are so disgusted that they now threaten to become co-operators and are of opinion that I have sold Lala Lajpat Rai, Deshabandhu Chitta Ranjan Das, Pandit Motilal Nehru, the Ali Brothers and others, and tells me that if I give up the leadership, there are thousands who will leave this world by committing suicide. I may assure the citizens of Lahore, in particular and the Punjabis in general, that I do not believe what is said of them. I used to receive such letters even during the Martial Law days, because of the suspension of Civil Disobedience, but I discounted all the news and on my reaching the Punjab in October, I found that I was right in my analysis of the Punjab mind and I discovered that there was no one to challenge the propriety of my act. I feel still more confident of the correctness of the decision of the Working Committee, but if it is found that the country repudiates my action, I shall not mind it. I can but do my duty. A leader is useless when he acts against the promptings of his own conscience,

surrounded as he must be by people holding all kinds of views. He will drift like an anchorless ship if he has not the inner voice to hold him firm and guide him. Above all, I can easily put up with the denial of the world, but any denial by me of my God is unthinkable, and if I did not give at this critical period of the struggle the advice that I have, I would be denying both God and Truth. The telegrams and letters I am receiving from all parts of the country thanking me for my decision—telegrams from both non-co-operators and co-operators—confirm my belief that the country appreciates the decision and that the Lahore writer has given undue prominence to some heated bazaar talk which was bound to take place after the Bardoli decision which, all of a sudden, disturbed all previous calculations. I can understand the effect of the first shock, but I am also sure that when the people begin to analyse the implications of non-violence, they will come to no other conclusion than that of the Working Committee.

And now for the questions of the correspondent:

(1) I am not likely to give up the lead of the movement unless I have a clear indication that the people want me to. One method of giving that indication is an adverse vote of the Working Committee or the All-India Congress Committee.

(2) I assure the public that Pandit Malaviyaji had absolutely no hand in shaping my decision. I have often yielded to Panditji, and it is always a pleasure for me to yield to him whenever I can and always painful to differ from one who has an unrivalled record of public service and who is sacrifice personified. But so far as the decision of suspension is concerned, I arrived at it on my reading the detailed report of the Chauri Chaura

tragedy in the *Chronicle*. It was in Bardoli that telegrams were sent convening the Working Committee meeting and it was in Bardoli that I sent a letter to the members of the Working Committee advising them of my desire to suspend Civil Disobedience. I went thereafter to Bombay at the instance of Panditji, who, together with the other friends of the Malaviya Conference, undoubtedly wished to plead with me for a suspension and who were agreeably surprised when I told them that, so far as I was concerned, my mind was made up, but that I had kept it open so that I could discuss the point thoroughly with the members of the Working Committee. The suspension has no reference to a round table conference or to any settlement. In my opinion, a round table conference is bound to prove fruitless. It requires a much stronger Viceroy than Lord Reading has proved to be to perceive the situation in the country and then to describe it correctly. I certainly feel that Pandit Malaviyaji has already come into the movement. It is not possible for him to keep away from the Congress or from danger, but the Bardoli decision was arrived at purely on its merits, and I could not have been shaken from the original purpose, had I not been unnerved by the Chauri Chaura tragedy which was the last straw.

(3) Nothing short of a full Dominion status is likely to satisfy me personally, and nothing short of complete severance will satisfy me, if the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs remain unredressed, but the exact form does not depend upon me. I have no clear-cut scheme. It has to be evolved by the people's representatives.

(4) At the present moment there is no question of a settlement. Therefore, the question as to what Panditji and all others will do is premature, if not irrelevant.

But assuming that Panditji holds any conference and that its resolutions are ignored by the Government, Panditji and others will act as all self-respecting men do in such circumstances.

(5) I can never give up the *idea* of Civil Disobedience, no matter what danger there is of violence, but I shall certainly give up the idea of *starting* mass Civil Disobedience, so long as there is a certain danger of violence. Individual Civil Disobedience stands on a different footing.

(6) There is no question of disbanding any Volunteer Corps, but the names of those who do not conform to the Congress pledge have certainly to be removed from the list if we are to be honest.

(7) If we have understood the essential parts of non-violence, we can but come to one conclusion that any eruption of widespread violence—and I call the Chauri Chaura tragedy widespread for the purpose—automatically stops mass Civil Disobedience. That many other parts of the country have nobly responded to the spirit of non-violence is good, but it is not good enough to continue mass Civil Disobedience even as a most *peaceful* meeting is disturbed if one man obstructs or commits violence. Mass Civil Disobedience for becoming successful requires a non-violent environment. The reason for restricting it to one single small area is to prevent violence elsewhere. It, therefore, means that mass Civil Disobedience in a particular area is possible when the other areas passively co-operate by remaining non-violent.

REPLY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

The Government of India in a Communique published on the 6th

February replied to Mr. Gandhi's Bardoli letter, repudiating his statements and urging that the issue before the country was no longer between this or that programme of political advance, but between lawlessness with all its consequences on the one hand and the maintenance of those principles which lie at the root of all civilised Governments. Mr. Gandhi issued the following rejoinder:

I have very carefully read the Government's reply to my letter. I confess that I was totally unprepared for such an evasion of the realities of the case as the reply betrays.

I will take the very first repudiation. The reply says they (the Government) emphatically repudiate the statement that they have embarked on a policy of lawless repression and also the suggestion that the present campaign of Civil Disobedience has been forced on the Non-Co-operation party in order to secure the elementary rights of free association, free speech and free press. Even a cursory glance at my letter would show that, whilst Civil Disobedience was authorised by the All-India Congress Committee meeting held on the 4th November at Delhi, it had not commenced. I have made it clear in my letter that the contemplated mass Civil Disobedience was indefinitely postponed on account of the regrettable events of the 17th November in Bombay. That decision was duly published and it is within the knowledge of the Government as also the public that herculean efforts were being made to combat the still lingering violent tendency amongst the people. It is also within the knowledge of the Government and the public that a special form of pledge was devised to be signed by volunteers with the deliberate purpose of keeping out all but men of proved character. The primary object of these volunteers' associations was to inculcate amongst the masses the lessons of non-violence and to keep the peace at all Non-co-operation

functions. Unfortunately, the Government of India lost its head completely over the Bombay events and, perhaps, still more over the very complete hartal on the same date at Calcutta. I do not wish to deny that there might have been some intimidation practised in Calcutta, but it was not, I venture to submit, the fact of intimidation, but the irritation caused by the completeness of the hartal that maddened the Government of India as also Government of Bengal. Repression there was even before that time, but nothing was said or done in connection with it. But the repression that came in the wake of the notifications proclaiming the Criminal Law Amendment Act for the purpose of dealing with volunteers' associations and the Seditious Meetings Act for the purpose of dealing with public meetings held by Non-co-operators, came upon the Non-co-operation community as a bombshell.

I repeat, then, that these notifications and the arrests of Deshbandu Chittaranjan Das and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in Bengal, the arrest of Pandit Motilal Nehru and his co-workers in the U. P. and of Lala Lajput Rai and his party in the Punjab made it absolutely necessary to take up, not yet aggressive Civil Disobedience, but only defensive Civil Disobedience, otherwise described as passive resistance. Even Sir Hormusji Wadia was obliged to declare that, if the Bombay Government followed the precedents set by the Governments of Bengal, U. P. and the Punjab, he would be bound to resist such notifications, that is, to enrol himself as a volunteer or to attend public meetings in defiance of Government order to the contrary. It is thus clear that a case has been completely made out for Civil Disobedience, unless the Government revised its policy which has resulted in the stopping of public meetings,

public associations and the Non-Co-operation press in many parts of India.

Now for the statement that the Government have embarked on a policy of lawless repression instead of an ample expression of regret and apology for the barbarous deeds that have been committed by officers in the name of law and order. I regret to find in the Government reply a categorical denial of any lawless repression. In this connection, I urge the public and Government carefully to consider the following facts whose substance is beyond challenge: (1) official shooting at Entally in Calcutta and the callous treatment even of a corpse, (2) The admitted brutality of the civil guards, (3) The forcible dispersal of a meeting at Dacca and the dragging of innocent men by their legs although they had given no offence or cause whatsoever, (4) Similar treatment of volunteers in Aligarh, (5) The conclusive (in my opinion) finding of the committee presided over by Dr. Gokhul Chand about the brutal and uncalled for assaults upon volunteers and the public in Lahore, (6) The wicked and inhuman treatment of volunteers and the public at Jullundur, (7) The shooting of a boy at Dehra Dun and the cruelly forcible dispersal of a public meeting of that place, (8) The looting admitted by the Bihar Government of villages by an officer and his company without any permission whatsoever, from any one, but, as stated by Non-co-operators, at the invitation of a planter, assaults upon volunteers and the burning of Khaddar and papers belonging to the Congress at Sonepur, (9) the midnight searches and arrests in the Congress and Khilafat offices.

I have merely given a sample of the many infallible proofs of official lawlessness and barbarism.* I have

* *Young India* published from week to week detailed accounts of these cases of alleged lawless repression.

mentioned not even a tithe of what is happening all over the country. I wish to state, without fear of successful contradiction, that the scale on which this lawlessness had gone on in so many provinces of India puts into shade the inhumanities that were practised in the Punjab, if we except the crawling order and the massacre at Jallianwalabagh. It is my certain conviction that the massacre at Jallianwallabagh was a clean transaction compared to the unclean transactions described above, and the pity of it is that, because people are not shot or butchered, the tortures through which hundreds of inoffensive men have gone through do not produce a sufficient effect to turn everybody's face against this Government.

But as if this warfare against innocence was not enough, the reins are being tightened in the jails. We know nothing of what is happening to-day in Karachi jail, to a solitary prisoner in the Sabarmati jail and to a batch in the Benares jail, all of whom are as innocent as I claim to be myself. Their crime consists in their constituting themselves the trustees of national honour and dignity. I am hoping that these proud and defiant spirits will not be sent into submission masquerading in the official garb. I deny the right of the authorities to insist on high-souled men appearing before them almost naked or paying any obsequious respect to them by way of salaming with open palms brought together, or reciting to the intonation of "Sarkar-ike-hai." No God-fearing man will do the latter even if he has to be kept standing in his stock for days and nights, as a Bengal schoolmaster is reported to have been for the sake of the dignity of human nature.

I trust that Lord Reading and his draftsmen do not know the facts that I have adduced or are being carried

away by their belief in the infallibility of their employees. I refuse to believe in the statements which the public regards as God's truth. If there is the slightest exaggeration in the statements that I have made, I shall as publicly withdraw them and apologise for them as I am making them now, but, as it is, I undertake to prove the substance of every one of these charges if not the very letter and much more of them, before any impartial tribunal of men or women unconnected with the Government. I invite Pandit Malaviyaji and those who are performing the thankless task of securing a round table conference to form an impartial commission to investigate these charges by which I stand or fall.

It is the physical and brutal ill-treatment of humanity which has made many of my co-workers and myself impatient of life itself, and, in the face of these things, I don't wish to take public time by dealing in detail what I mean by abuse of the common law of the country but I cannot help correcting the mis-impression which is likely to be created in connection with the Bombay disorders, disgraceful and deplorable as they were. Let it be remembered that, of the persons who lost their lives, over 45 were Non-co-operators or their sympathisers, the hooligans, and of the 400 wounded, to be absolutely on the safe side, over 350 were also derived from the same class. I do not complain; the co-operators, the Non-co-operators and the friendly hooligans got what they deserved: they began the violence and they reaped the reward. Let it also not be forgotten that, with all deference to the Bombay Government, it was Non-co-operators, ably assisted by Independents and co-operators, who brought peace out of that chaos of the two days following the fateful 17th.

I must totally deny the imputation that the application

of the Criminal Law Amendment Act was confined to associations the majority of the members of which had habitually indulged in violence and intimidation. The prisons of India to-day hold some of the most inoffensive men and hardly any who are convicted under the law. Abundant proof can be produced in support of this statement as also of the statement of the fact that almost wherever meetings have been broken up, there was actually no risk of violence.

The Government of India deny that the Viceroy has laid down upon the apology of the Ali Brothers the civilised policy of non-interference with the non-violent activities of Non-co-operators. I am extremely sorry for this repudiation. The very part of the communique reproduced in the reply is in my opinion sufficient proof that the Government did not intend to interfere with such activities. The Government did not wish to be inferred that speeches promoting disaffection of a less violent character were not an offence against the law. I have never stated that breach of any law was not to be an offence against it, but I have stated, as I repeat now, that it was not the intention of the Government then to prosecute for non-violent activities, although they might amount to a technical breach of the law.

As to the conditions of the conference, the Government reply evidently omits to mention the two words "and otherwise" after the words "Calcutta speech" in my letter. I repeat that the terms "I would gather from the Calcutta speech and otherwise" were nearly the same that were mentioned in the resolutions of the Malaviya Conference. What are called the unlawful activities of the N. C. O. party, being a reply to the notifications of the Government, would have ceased automatically with the withdrawal of those notifica-

tions, because the formation of volunteer corps and public meetings would not be unlawful activities after the withdrawal of the offending notification. Even while the negotiations were going on in Calcutta, the discharge of Fatwa prisoners was asked for, and I can only repeat what I have said elsewhere that, if it is disloyal to say that military service under the existing system of Government is a sin against God and humanity, I fear that such disloyalty must continue.

The Government communique does me a cruel wrong imputing to me a desire that the proposed round table conference should be called merely to register my decrees. I did state, in order to avoid any misunderstanding the Congress demands, as I felt I was in duty bound, in as clear terms as possible. No Congressman could approach any conference without making his position clear. I accepted the ordinary courtesy of not considering me or any Congressmen to be impervious to reason or argument. It is open to anybody to convince me that the demands of the Congress regarding the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj are wrong or unreasonable and I would certainly retrace my steps and, so far as I am concerned, rectify the wrong. The Government of India know that such has been always my attitude.

The communique, strangely enough, says that the demands set forth in my manifesto are even larger than those of the Working Committee. I claim that they fall far below the demands of the Working Committee, for what I now ask against the total suspension of Civil Disobedience of an aggressive character is merely the stoppage of ruthless repression, the release of prisoners convicted under it and a clear declaration of policy. The demands of the Working Committee included a round table conference. In my manifesto, I

have not asked for a Round Table Conference at all. It is true that this wanting of a Round Table Conference does not proceed from any expediency, but it is a confession of present weakness. I freely recognise that, unless India becomes saturated with the spirit of non-violence and generates disciplined strength that can only come from non-violence, she cannot enforce her demands, and it is for that reason that I now consider that the first thing for the people to do is to secure a reversal of this mad repression and then to concentrate upon more complete organisation and more construction. And here again the communique does me an injustice by merely stating the Civil Disobedience of an aggressive character will be postponed until the opportunity is given to the imprisoned leaders of reviewing the whole situation after their discharge and by conveniently omitting to mention the following conclusion of my letter. "If the Government make the requested declaration, I shall regard it as an honest desire on its part to give effect to public opinion and shall therefore have no hesitation in advising the country to be engaged in further moulding public opinion without violent restraint from either side and trust to its working to secure the fulfilment of its unalterable demands. Aggressive Civil Disobedience in that case will be taken up only when the Government departs from its policy of strictest neutrality or refuse to yield to the clearly expressed opinion of the vast majority of the people of India."

I venture to claim extreme reasonableness and moderation for the above presentation of the case. The alternative before the people, therefore, is not, as the communique concludes, between "lawlessness with all its disastrous consequences on the one hand and on the other the maintenance of those principles

which lie at the root of all civilised Governments." Mass Civil Disobedience, it adds, is fraught with such danger to the State that it must be met with "sterness and severity." The choice before the people is mass Civil Disobedience with all its undoubted dangers and lawless repression of the lawful activities of the people. I hold that it is impossible for any body of self-respecting men for fear of unknown dangers to sit still and do nothing effective when looting of property and assaulting of innocent men are going on all over the country in the name of law and order.

24th November, 1921

THE BOMBAY RIOTS

A Deep Stain.—Under the foregoing heading, Mr. Gandhi published the following note after having witnessed the unfortunate disturbances in Bombay:

The reputation of Bombay, the hope of my dreams, was being stained yesterday even whilst in my simplicity I was congratulating the citizens upon their non-violence in the face of provocation. For the volunteers with their captain were arrested during the previous night for pasting posters under authority on private property. The posters advised the people to boycott the welcome to the Prince. They were destroyed. The Swaraj Sabha's office was mysteriously entered and the unused posters, so far as I am aware not declared unlawful, were also removed. The Prince's visit itself and the circumstances attending the ceremonials arranged and public money wasted for the manufacture of a welcome to His Royal Highness constituted an unbearable provocation. And yet Bombay had remained self-restrained. This, I thought, was a matter for congratulation. The burning of the pile of foreign cloth was an eloquent counter-demonstration to the interested official demonstration.

Little did I know that at the very time that the Prince was passing through the decorated route and the pile of foreign cloth was burning, in another part of the city the mill hands were in criminal disobedience

of the wishes of their masters emptying them, first one and then the others, by force, that a swelling mob was molesting peaceful passengers in the tramcars and holding up the tram traffic, that it was forcibly depriving those that were wearing foreign caps of their head-dresses and pelting inoffensive Europeans. As the day went up, the fury of the mob now intoxicated with its initial success rose also. They burnt tramcars and a motor, smashed liquor shops and burnt two.

I heard of the outbreak at about 1 o'clock. I motored with some friends to the area of disturbance and heard the most painful and the most humiliating story of molestation of Parsi sisters. Some few were assaulted, and even had their *sadis* torn from them. No one from among a crowd of over fifteen hundred who had surrounded my car denied the charge, as a Parsi with hot rage and quivering lips was with the greatest deliberation relating the story. An elderly Parsi gentleman said, "Please save us from this mob rule." This news of the rough handling of Parsi sisters pierced me like a dart. I felt that my sisters or daughters had been hurt by a violent mob! Yes, some Parsis had joined the welcome. They had a right to hold their own view free of molestation. There can be no coercion in Swaraj. The Moplah fanatic who forcibly converts a Hindu believes that he is acquiring religious merit. A non-co-operator or his associate who uses coercion has no apology whatsoever for his criminality.

As I reached the Two Tanks, I found a liquor shop smashed, two policemen badly wounded and lying unconscious on cots without anybody caring for them. I alighted. Immediately the crowd surrounded me and yelled "Mahatma Gandhiki jai." That sound usually grates on my ears, but it has grated never so much as it did yesterday when the crowd unmindful of the two sick brethren choked me with the shout at the top of their voices. I rebuked them and they were silent. Water was brought for the two wounded men. I requested two of my companions and some from the crowd to take the dying policemen to the hospital. I proceeded then to the scene a little further up where I saw a fire rising. There were two tramcars which were burnt by the crowd. On returning, I witnessed a burning motor car. I appealed to the crowd to disperse, told them that they had damaged the cause of the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj. I returned sick at heart and in a chastened mood.

At about five, a few brave Sindhi young men came to report that in Bhindi Bazaar the crowd was molesting every passer-by who had a foreign cap on and even seriously beating him, if he refused to give

up his cap. A brave old Parsi who defied the crowd and would not give up his *Pugree* was badly handled. Maulana Azad Sobhani and I went to Bhindi Bazaar and reasoned with the crowd, told them that they were denying their religion by hurting innocent men. The crowd made a show of dispersing. The Police were there but they were exceedingly restrained. We went further and, on retracing our steps, found to our horror a liquor shop on fire. Even the fire brigade was obstructed in its work. Thanks to the efforts of Pandit Nekiram Sharma and others, the inmates of the shop were able to come out.

The crowd did not consist of hooligans only or boys. It was not an unintelligent crowd. They were not all mill hands. It was essentially a mixed crowd unprepared and unwilling to listen to anybody For the moment it had lost its head. And it was not a crowd but several crowds numbering in all not less than twenty thousand. It was bent upon mischief and destruction.

I heard that there was firing resulting in deaths and that in the Anglo-Indian quarters every one came in for hard beating, if he did not put off his *Khadi* cap or shirt. I heard that many were seriously injured. I am writing this in the midst of six Hindu and Mussalman workers who have just come in with broken heads and bleeding and one with a broken nasal bone and other lacerated wounds and in danger of losing his life. They went to Parel led by Maulanas Azad Sobani and Mozzam Ali to pacify the mill hands, who, it was reported, were holding up tramcars there. The workers, however, were unable to proceed to their destination. They returned with their bleeding wounds to speak for themselves.

Thus the hope of reviving mass Civil Disobedience has once more in my opinion been dashed to pieces. The atmosphere for mass Civil Disobedience is absent. It is not enough to say that such an atmosphere is to be found in Bardoli, and, therefore, it may go on side by side with the violence in Bombay. This is impossible. Neither Bardoli nor Bombay can be treated as separate, unconnected units. They are parts of one great indivisible whole. It was possible to isolate Malabar. It was also possible to disregard Malegaon. But it is not possible to ignore Bombay.

Non-co-operators cannot escape liability. It is true that Non-co-operators were ceaselessly remonstrating everywhere with the people at considerable risk to themselves, to arrest or stop the mischief and that they are responsible for saving many precious lives. But that is not enough for launching out on Civil Disobedience or to dischage us from liability for the violence that has taken place. We claim to

have established a peaceful atmosphere, *i.e.*, to have attained by our non-violence sufficient control over the people to keep their violence under check. We have failed when we ought to have succeeded. For yesterday was a day of our trial. We were under our pledge bound to protect the person of the Prince from any harm or insult. And we broke that pledge inasmuch as any one of us insulted or injured a single European or any other who took part in the welcome to the Prince. They were as much entitled to take part in the welcome as we were to refrain. Nor can I shirk my own personal responsibility. I am more instrumental than any other in bringing into being the spirit of revolt. I find myself not fully capable of controlling and disciplining that spirit. I must do penance for it. For me the struggle is essentially religious. I believe in fasting and prayer, and I propose henceforth to observe every Monday a twenty-four hours' fast till Swaraj is attained.

The Working Committee will have to devote its attention to the situation and consider in the light thereof whether mass Civil Disobedience can be at all encouraged until we have obtained complete control over the masses. I have personally come deliberately to the conclsuion that mass Civil Disobedience cannot be started for the present. I confess my inability to conduct a campaign of Civil Disobedience to a successful issue unless a completely non-violent spirit is generated among the people. I am sorry for the conclusion. It is a humiliating confession of my incapacity, but I know that I shall appear more pleasing to my Maker by being what I am instead of appearing to be what I am not. If I can have nothing to do with the organised violence of the Government, I can have less to do with the unorganised violence of the people. I would prefer to be crushed between the two.

APPEALS ON THE SITUATION

As soon as riots broke out in Bombay on November 17th, Mahatma Gandhi engaged himself wholly in re-establishing peace by visiting the disturbed areas and issuing appeals to his co-workers as well as to the breakers of peace. These were published in "Young India" of 24th November and 1st December as well as

in the Press. We give below a summary of these appeals :

Mr. Gandhi's Appeal to Bombay Citizens.—This appeal Mr. Gandhi wrote at 3-30 A.M. on the 19th November. "I must refuse," he said in it, "to eat or drink anything but water till the Hindus and Mussalmans of Bombay have made peace with the Parsis, the Christians and the Jews, and till the Non-co-operators have made peace with the co-operators." "The Swaraj that I have witnessed during the last two days has stunk in my nostrils." "I invite my fellow-workers," he added, "not to waste a single word of sympathy for me. I need or deserve none. But I invite them to make a ceaseless effort to regain control over the turbulent elements." "The Mussalmans have to my knowledge," concluded the Mahatmaji, "played the leading part during the two days of carnage. It has deeply hurt me. I ask every Mussalman worker to rise to his full height, to realise his duty to his faith and see that the carnage stops."

An Appeal to the Mavalis (Hooligans) of Bombay.—In this appeal which Mr. Gandhi issued on the 21st November, he wrote *inter alia*: "Whether you call yourself a Hindu, Mussalman, Parsi, Christian or Jew, you have certainly failed to consider even your own religious interests. . . You have used the mass awakening for your own lust for plunder, rapine, and even indulging in your worst animal appetite. Some of my friends would, I know, accuse me of ignorance of human nature. If I believed the charge, I would plead guilty and retire from human assemblies and return only after acquiring knowledge of human nature." Mr. Gandhi went on to state that he had no difficulty in controlling the Indian Mavalis of S. Africa and concluded by asking them to stop retaliation and give him and his workers a chance to work among them.

To Co-workers.—In his appeal to co-workers dated 22nd November, Mahatma Gandhi stated that the majority being weak enough to do violence, the minority, Jews, Parsis and Christians,sought Government aid and indulged in retaliatory madness with that aid against the white cap-wearing innocent men without the police or the military raising a finger to stop it. "So the task before the workers," he said, "is to take the blows from the Government and our erring countrymen." "We must secure the co-operation of the rowdies of Bombay. . . They must either be amenable to our love or helplessly submit to the bayonet. They may not seek shelter under the banner of non-violence for the purpose of doing violence. . . We must reach the rowdy

element, befriend them and help them to understand the religious character of the struggle. We must neither neglect them nor pander to them. We must become their servants." Continuing, Mr. Gandhi emphasised that the workers must respect the freedom of others to co-operate, to use foreign cloth or whatever they liked to do. "Our struggle," he concluded, "consists in winning opponents, including Englishmen to our side. We can only do so by being free from ill-will against the weakest or the strongest of them. And this we can only do by being prepared to die for the faith within us and not by killing those who do not see the truth we enunciate."

Fast Broken.—Peace was restored the next day and, at the instance of the leaders of all the communities of all political parties, Mahatma Gandhi publicly broke his fast at a public breakfast. Speaking on the occasion, he said he found peace only in an empty stomach as a result of the disturbances and exhorted all not to resort to violence in the future but each community and party to respect the freedom of the other.

MOPLAH OUTBREAK

On August 19th, the Moplahs of Malabar broke out in open revolt. The immediate cause for the outbreak was the attempted arrest by the District Magistrate of some Khilafat workers at Tirurangadi. The Moplahs, however, seem to plead grave provocation in the shape of ruthless repression of all legitimate activities. The Moplahs not only resisted the arrests, but broke out in open rebellion at first against Government, but subsequently against the Hindu population as well. There were innumerable cases of looting Hindu houses, forced conversions and unmentionable atrocities on the Hindu population as a result of Moplah ignorance and fanaticism. The Muslim public were naturally unwilling to believe these and at least one or two Muslim public men almost condoned these. Moulana Hasrat Mohani, for instance, was one such and he said that Moplahs simply fought for their religion. The Congress workers in Malabar naturally resented this. Mahatma Gandhi, writing under the heading "Hindus and Moplahs" in *Young India* of 26th January, 1922, while sympathising with the Hindus, pointed out that Non-co-operation was self-realisation and that the Hindus must develop sufficient strength of will to withstand brute force and die in the act if necessary.

Under the heading, "The two incompatibles," Mr. Gandhi wrote in

Young India of 6th September, 1921, condemning Moplah violence and pointing out that violence is the obstacle to success.

CONGRESS RESOLUTIONS

Amritsar, Calcutta, Nagpur and Ahmedabad resolutions are summarised in the History of Non-co-operation given in the beginning of the book.

DELHI CONDITIONS

See the " History of Non-co-operation " given in the beginning of the book.

CHAURI CHAURA RIOTS

See the " History of Non-co-operation " in the beginning of the book.

SWADESHI VOW

The following is the Swadeshi vow suggested for adoption by all :

" With God as my witness, I solemnly declare that from to-day I shall confine myself for my personal requirements, to the use of cloth manufactured in India from Indian cotton, silk and wool ; and I shall altogether abstain from using foreign cloth in my possession."

It will be noticed that the above permits the use of Indian mill-made cloth. The two other vows were more difficult of fulfilment.

THE SATYAGRAHA PLEDGE

The following is the text of the Satyagraha Pledge :

Being conscientiously of opinion that the Bills known as the Indian Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill No. I of 1919, and the Criminal Law (Emergency Powers) Bill No. II of 1919, are unjust, subversive of the principle of liberty and justice, and destructive of the elementary rights of individuals on which the safety of the community as a whole and the State itself is based, we solemnly affirm that in the event of these Bills becoming law until they are withdrawn, we shall refuse civilly to obey these laws and such other laws as a committee to be hereafter appointed may think fit and further affirm that in this struggle we will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person or property.

[F]

CONSTITUTION OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS ORGANISATION

As adopted by the Congress of 1908, and amended by the Congresses of 1911, 1912, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1920

THE OBJECT

ARTICLE I.—The object of the Indian National Congress is the attainment of Swaraj by the people of India by all legitimate and peaceful means.

ARTICLE II.—*The Sessions of the Congress*—(*a*) The Indian National Congress shall ordinarily meet once every year during Christmas holidays at such a place as may have been decided upon at its previous session or such other place as may have been determined by the All-India Congress Committee hereinafter referred to.

(*b*) An extraordinary session of the Congress may be summoned by the All-India Congress Committee either of its own motion or on the requisition of a majority of the Provincial Congress Committees, wherever it may deem it advisable to hold such a session; and the Articles of this Constitution shall apply with such modifications as the All-India Congress Committee may consider necessary in respect of each session.

Component Parts of the Congress Organisation

ARTICLE III.—The Indian National Congress Organisation shall consist of the following:

(*a*) The Indian National Congress. (*b*) Provincial Congress Committees. (*c*) District Congress Committees. (*d*) Sub-Divisional, Taluqa or Tehasil, Firka or other Local Congress Committees. (*e*) The All-India Congress Committee. (*f*) Such other committees outside India as may from time to time be recognised by the Congress in this behalf. (*g*) Bodies formed or organised periodically by the Provincial, District, Taluqa or Tehasil, Firka or other Local Congress Committees such as the Reception Committee of the Congress and the Provincial, District, Taluqa or Tehasil or other Local Conferences.

ARTICLE IV.—*Membership*—No person shall be eligible to be a member of any of the organisations, referred to in the foregoing Article, unless he or she has attained the age of 21 and expresses in writing his or her acceptance of the object and the methods as laid

down in Article 1 of this Constitution and of the Rules of the Congress.

Provincial Congress Committees

ARTICLE V.—The following shall be the Provinces with headquarters mentioned against them and, where no headquarters are mentioned or in every other case, the respective Provincial Congress Committees shall have the power to fix or alter them from time to time.

	PROVINCE		LANGUAGE	HEAD-QUARTER
1	Madras	...	(Tamil)	Madras
2	Andhra	...	(Telugu)	
3	Karnatak	...	(Canarese)	Gadag
4	Kerala	...	(Malayalam)	Calicut
5	City of Bombay	...	(Marathi & Gujrati)	Bombay
6	Maharashtra	...	(Marathi)	Poona
7	Gujarat	...	(Gujrati)	Ahmedabad
8	Sindh	...	(Sindhi)	
9	United Provinces	...	(Hindustani)	Allahabad
10	Punjab	...	(Punjabi)	Lahore
11	Frontier Prov.	...	(Hindustani)	Peshawar
12	Delhi	...	(Hindustani)	Delhi
13	Ajmer, Merwar, & Br. Rajputana	...	(Hindustani)	Ajmer
14	Central Prov.	...	(Hindustani)	Jubbulpore
15	Central Prov.	...	(Marathi)	Nagpur
16	Berar	...	(Marathi)	Amraoti
17	Behar	...	(Hindustani)	Patna
18	Utkal Orissa	...	(Oriya)	
19	Bengal & Surma Valley	...	(Bengali)	Calcutta
20	Assam	...	(Assamese)	Gauhati
21	Burma	...	(Burmese)	Rangoon

Provided that the All-India Congress Committee may from time to time assign particular Indian States to particular Provinces and a Provincial Congress Committee may in its turn allot particular Indian States assigned to it by the All-India Congress Committee to particular Districts within its jurisdiction.

The existing Provincial Congress Committees shall forthwith proceed to reorganise themselves in terms of this Constitution. Such reorganisation shall be final, until it is revised by the All-India Congress Committee.

ARTICLE VI.—(*a*) There shall be a Provincial Congress Committee in and for each of the Provinces named in the foregoing article.

(*b*) Each Provincial Congress Committee shall organise district and other committees referred to in article III and shall have the power to frame rules for laying down conditions of membership and for the conduct of business, not inconsistent with this constitution or any rules made by the All-India Congress Committee.

(*c*) Each Provincial Congress Committee shall consist of representatives elected annually by the members of the district and other Committees in accordance with the rules made by the Provincial Congress Committees.

ARTICLE VII.—*Membership of local Congress Organisation*—Every person not disqualified under article IV and paying a subscription of 4 as. per year shall be entitled to become a member of any organisation controlled by Provincial Congress Committees.

ARTICLE VIII.—*Election of Delegates*—Each Provincial Congress Committee shall be responsible for the election of delegates to the Congress creed.

No one shall be qualified for election who is not of the age of 21 years and who does not subscribe to the Congress creed.

The number of delegates shall be not more than one for every 50 thousand of the inhabitants of the Province in its jurisdiction, including the Native States therein, in accordance with the last census: provided, however, that the inclusion of Native States in the electorate shall not be taken to include any interference by the Congress with the internal affairs of such States.

Each Provincial Congress Committee shall frame rules for the election of delegates and representation of minorities, special interests or classes needing special protection.

The rules shall provide for the organisation of electorates and shall prescribe the procedure to be adopted for securing the proportional representation (by a single transferable vote) of every variety of political opinion.

The rules framed by each Provincial Congress Committee shall be sent to the General Secretaries of the Congress not later than the 30th April 1921, which rules shall be published for general information by the Secretaries as soon as possible after the receipt thereof.

Each Provincial Congress Committee shall send to the Reception Committee of the ensuing Session of the Congress, an alphabetical list of the delegates so elected containing the full name, occupation, age, sex, religion and address of each of them to reach the Committee

not later than the 15th day of December every year, and in the case of an Extraordinary Session, not later than ten days before the date advertised for the holding of such Session.

ARTICLE IX.—*Subscription*—(*a*) Each Provincial Congress Committee shall pay annually such subscription to the All-India Congress Committee as may be fixed by the latter from time to time.

(*b*) No Member of the Congress Committee shall vote at the election of representatives or delegates or be elected as such, unless and until he has paid the subscription due by him.

ARTICLE X.—*Delegation Certificates*—Each committee referred to in the Article VIII shall issue certificates to the delegates duly elected in accordance with the form hereto attached, marked appendix A, and signed by the Secretary of the Committee.

ARTICLE XI.—*Delegation fees*—Every delegate on presenting such a certificate and paying a fee of Rs. 10 at the Congress office shall receive a ticket entitling him to admission to the Congress Pandal.

ARTICLE XII.—*Right to vote*—Delegates shall alone have the power of voting at the Congress sittings or otherwise taking part in its deliberations.

ARTICLE XIII.—*Reception Committee*—The Reception Committee shall be formed by the Provincial Congress Committee, at least six months before the meeting of the annual session and may include persons who are not members of the Provincial Congress Committee. The members of the Reception Committee shall pay not less than Rs. 25 each.

ARTICLE XIV.—The Reception Committee shall elect its Chairman and other office bearers from among its own members.

ARTICLE XV.—It shall be the duty of the Reception Committee to collect funds for the expenses of the Congress Session, to elect President of the Congress in the manner set forth in the following article, and to make all necessary arrangements for the reception and accommodation of delegates and guests, and as far as practicable, of visitors, and for the printing and publication of the report of the proceedings, and to submit a statement of receipt and expenditure to the Provincial Congress Committee within 4 months of the Congress Session.

ARTICLE XVI.—*Election of President.*—The several Provincial Congress Committees shall, as far as possible, by the end of June, suggest to the Reception Committee the names of persons who are, their opinion, eligible for the Presidentship of the Congress as the Reception Committee shall, as far as possible, in the first week of July,

submit to all the Provincial Committees the names as suggested for their final recommendations, provided that such final recommendation will be of any one, but not more, of such names, and the Reception Committee shall as far as possible meet on the month of August to consider such recommendations. If the person recommended by a majority of the Provincial Congress Committees is accepted by a majority of the members of the Reception Committee, present at a special meeting called for the purpose, that person shall be the President of the next Congress. If, however, the Reception Committee is unable to accept the president recommended by the Provincial Congress Committees, or in the case of emergency by resignation, death or otherwise of the President elected in this manner, the matter shall forthwith be referred by it to the All-India Congress Committee whose decision shall be arrived at, as far as possible, before the end of September: in either case the election shall be final, provided that in no case shall the person so elected as President belong to the province in which the Congress is to be held.

The President of a special or extraordinary session shall be elected by the All-India Congress Committee, subject to the same Proviso.

ARTICLE XVII.—*Disposal of Funds*.—(a) The Reception Committee shall, through, the Provincial Congress Committee of the Province, remit to the All-India Congress Committee not later than two weeks after the termination of the Congress Session, ordinary or extraordinary, half the delegation fees from the Congress Fund.

(b) If the Reception Committee has a balance after defraying all the expenses of the session, it shall hand over the same to the Provincial Congress Committee in the Province in which the session was held to form the Provincial Congress Fund for that province.

ARTICLE XVIII.—*Audit*.—The receipts and expenditure of the Reception Committee shall be audited by an auditor or auditors, appointed by the Provincial Congress Committee concerned, and the statement of accounts together with the Auditors' report shall be sent by the Provincial Congress Committee not later than six months from the termination of the Congress to the All-India Congress Committee.

The All-India Congress Committee

ARTICLE XIX.—The All-India Congress Committee shall consist of 350 members, exclusive of Ex-Officio members. The Ex-Officio members shall be all past presidents of the Congress and the General Secretaries and treasurers of the Congress.

Each Provincial Congress Committee shall elect the alloted number of members of the All-India Congress Committee from among the members of the Congress Committees within their jurisdiction.

The allotment shall be on the basis of the population according to the linguistic redistribution of Provinces or in such other manner as may appear more equitable to the All-India Congress Committee, and shall be published by the All-India Congress Committee before the 31st day of January 1921.

The method of election shall be the same as already prescribed for the election of delegates.

Election to the All-India Congress Committee shall ordinarily be in the month of November.

The first All-India Congress Committee under this Constitution shall be elected on or before the 30th June 1921. Until then the members of the All-India Congress Committee recently elected shall continue in office.

ARTICLE XX.—The Secretaries of the respective Provincial Congress Committees shall issue certificates of membership of the All-India Committee to the persons so elected.

ARTICLE XXI.—The All-India Congress Committee shall be the Committee of the Congress from year to year and deal with all the new matters that may arise during the year and may not be provided for by the Congress itself. For this purpose, the All-India Congress Committee shall have the power to frame its own rules not inconsistent with this Constitution.

ARTICLE XXII.—(a) The President of the Congress shall be the Chairman of the All-India Congress Committee for the year following.

ARTICLE XXIII.—*The General Secretaries*—The Indian National Congress shall have three General Secretaries who shall be annually elected by the Congress. They shall prepare the report of the work of the All-India Congress Committee during the year and submit it with a full account of the funds which may come into their hands to the All-India Congress Committee at a meeting to be held at the place and about the time of the session of the Congress for the year; and copies of such account and report shall then be presented to the Congress and sent to the Congress Committees.

ARTICLE XXIV.—*Working Committee.*—The All-India Congress Committee shall at its first meeting appoint a Working Committee consisting of the President, the General Secretaries, the Treasurers and nine other members which shall perform such functions as may

be delegated to it from time to time by the All-India Congress Committee.

ARTICLE XXV.—*Meetings of the All-India Congress Committee*—The All-India Congress Committee shall meet as often as may be necessary for the discharge of its obligations, and every time upon requisition by 15 members thereof, who shall state in their requisition the definite purpose for which they desire a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee.

The Subjects Committee

ARTICLE XXVI.—*Subjects Committee*—The members of the All-India Congress Committee shall constitute the Subjects Committee for the ordinary or the extraordinary session following.

ARTICLE XXVIII.—The Subjects Committee shall meet at least two days before the meeting of the Congress in open session. At this meeting, the President-elect shall preside and the outgoing Secretaries shall submit the draft programme of the work for the ensuing sessions of the Congress, including resolutions recommended by the different Provincial Congress Committees for adoption.

ARTICLE XXIX.—The Subjects Committee shall proceed to discuss the said programme and shall frame resolutions to be submitted to the open session.

ARTICLE XXX.—The Subjects Committee shall also meet from time to time as the occasion may require, during the pendency of the Congress Session.

Contentious subjects, and Interests of Minorities.—(*a*) No subject shall be passed for discussion by the Subjects Committee or allowed to be discussed at any Congress by the President thereof, to the introduction of which the Hindu or Mahomedan Delegates as a body object by a majority of ¾ ths of their number; and if, after the discussion of any subject, which has been admitted for discussion, it shall appear that the Hindu or Mahomedan Delegates, as a body, are by majority of ¾ ths of their number, opposed to the resolution which it is proposed to pass thereon, such resolution shall be dropped.

ARTICLE XXXI.—*Rules.*—The All-India Congress Committee shall have the power to frame rules in respect of all matters not covered by the constitution and not inconsistent with its articles.

ARTICLE XXXII.—*Repeal.*—The article and the creed of the constitution now in force are hereby repealed without prejudice to all acts done thereunder.

DRAFT MODEL RULES FOR PROVINCIAL CONGRESS COMMITTEES

The following draft rules were suggested in *Young India*:

1. The old Provincial Congress Committee or the old District Congress Committee of a newly created Province shall form the Provincial Congress Committee under the new Constitution.

2. The existing members who accept the new creed shall forthwith proceed to divide the Province into districts, the existing political districts being retained wherever possible.

3. Each such district shall divide itself into Calukas or Tahsils, the existing divisions being retained so far as possible.

4. Each Caluka shall divide itself into firkas or circles.

5. Each existing District Committee shall enrol, from among the villagers within its jurisdiction, as many members as are eligible under the constitution and these members shall form the electoral roll for the election of delegates to the Congress and representatives for the various district Congress Committees.

6. An alphabetical list of members with the full name and address and occupation of each shall be forwarded to the Provincial Congress Committee every Monday.

7. Each District Committee shall be responsible for the collection of subscription of the members and shall remit half of the proceeds to the Provincial Congress Committee at the same time as the list referred to in rule 6.

8. Each village containing more than five members of a Congress organisation formed for it shall elect its secretary, treasurer, chairman, and two other members who shall form the Village Panchayat or Mahajan.

9. Each such Panchayat shall be responsible for the primary education of every child, male or female, residing in the Village, for the introduction of spinning wheels in every home, for the organisation of hygiene and sanitation therein, and for carrying out all the other items of the Non-co-operation resolution of the Congress, in so far as it is applicable to such Village.

10. It shall be the duty of every District Committee to supervise and regulate the work of village and other organisations within its jurisdiction.

11. Each District Committee shall consist of ten members elected by the members belonging to the different organisations and shall as far as possible contain Mussalmans in proportion to the Mussalman

population of the District and shall contain so far as possible at least one member belonging to the female sex and one belonging to the depressed classes.

12. The representatives of a District Committee so elected shall from among themselves elect their chairman, treasurer, and secretary.

13. The representatives elected to the District Committees shall elect representatives to the Provincial Congress Committees subject to the same provisions as in rule 11. The number to be ten more than the number attached for the A. I. C. C.

14. The representatives so elected shall elect from among themselves chairman, secretary, treasurer and four other members who shall conduct the affairs of the province and shall be responsible to the Provincial Committee for the due carrying out of the Congress resolutions from time to time.

15. The election of representatives to the District Congress Committees shall take place on the 21st February 1921 and shall be on the basis of the roll of members as on the 15th day of February at 5 p. m.

16. Elections shall take place at a convenient place to be appointed by each District Congress Committee in an open manner and at a meeting of the electors convened for the purpose, the secretary of the committee shall be the convener and the election officer.

17. The election of representatives of the Provincial Congress Committee shall take place on the 4th March 1921 at the head-quarters of the Province. The Secretary of the outgoing Provincial Congress Committee shall be the convener and the election officer.

18. Electors of the Provincial Congress Coimmttee may register their vote by post.

19. Results of all elections shall be sent to the press for publication by the Secretary.

20. The Secretaries of the Provincial Congress Committees and the District Congress Committees should so far as possible be whole-time workers and may if necessary be paid out of the Provincial or District funds.

21. Election of delegates to the Congress shall take place on the 15th Nov. 1921.

22. The Provincial Congress Committee shall assign as far as possible in proportion of the population of each Taluka of delegates to be elected by it. And the elections shall take place in such Taluka at a central place to be selected by the District Committee and shall be supervised by agents affiliated by the District Committees.

23. The result of elections shall be forwarded by the respective District Committees not later than the 1st December 1921.

24. The Provincial Congress Committee shall meet at least once every month and consider reports from District organizations and adopt measures for the furtherance of the resolutions passed by the Congress.

25. These rules shall be in force for one year ending 31st December 1921 and till such time as they are received by the new Provincial Congress Committee or altered or amended from time to time.

Commenting on the above, Mahatma Gandhi wrote:

For the purpose of facilitating the work of the Provincial Congress Committees, I have ventured to frame the foregoing draft rules which they will naturally alter as they please or reject in toto. They are merely designed to serve for guidance. There is no time to lose if we are to set the whole of the new machinery in motion by the end of June, as we are bound to, under the new constitution. If we can bring into being the new organisation in an orderly and efficient manner and succeed in enrolling hundreds of thousands of men and women as active workers, determined to carry out the Non-co-operation resolution, he who runs may see that we shall have accomplished a peaceful and bloodless revolution within one year. The whole of the scheme of Non-co-operation is based upon the supposition that the British control is independent upon the voluntary association with it of the people. It is true that it is unconscious; it is true, too true, that it is due to fear; it is true that it is due to a variety of tempting inducements held out to a few of us. The present movement then is an attempt to show that the moment we cease to give our voluntary association, to fear and be tempted, that moment we become a free people. I hold that this process is not so difficult as many imagine. The current year will show whether my opinion is justified. The thousands who gathered under Congress pandal have shared my belief. It is now for them to translate their belief into action.

AN INSTRUCTIVE TABLE

The following appeared in *Young India* of January 1921:

By the courtesy of the Secretary of the Reception Committee, I am

able to give the following table showing the number of delegates who attended the Congress and their composition :

NUMBER OF DELEGATES

No.	Name of Province	No. of delegates under the constitution	Actual Arrivals
1	Andhra	360	383
2	Kerala	160	33
3	Maharashtra	292	263
4	Karnataka	320	304
5	Gujarat	185	185
6	Bombay	18	17
7	Burma	100	56
8	Punjab and N.W.F. ...	540	518
9	Sindh	71	63
10	Delhi	100	92
11	Rajputana	400	399
12	Utkal	300	108
13	C. P. (Marathi)	50	44
14	Assam	63	17
15	Berar	61	58
16	Madras	410	162
17	Bengal	986	373
18	United Provinces	960	888
19	C. P. (Hindusthani) ...	209	205
20	Bihar	588	558
		6,173	4,726

ANALYSIS OF THE ATTENDANCE

No.	Ladies	Musal.	Parsis	Sikhs	Antyajas	The rest
1	8	10	...	...	...	365
2	...	1	...	...	...	32
3	1	9	...	...	...	253
4	9	29	...	...	...	266
5	11	22	5	...	2	145
6	3	2	...	...	...	15
7	...	2	...	...	...	51
8	17	67	...	54	...	380
9	1	11	...	...	...	61

No.	Ladies	Musal.	Parsis	Sikhs	Antyajas	The rest
10	7	13	...	4	...	68
11	11	13	...	...	...	375
12	...	3	...	...	...	105
13	1	5	...	...	...	38
14	...	2	...	...	...	15
15	2	5	...	...	...	5
16	2	13	...	...	...	147
17	10	36	...	4	...	323
18	10	114	...	3	...	761
19	6	29	...	...	...	170
20	7	83	...	...	...	468
	106	469	5	65	2	4079

It will be noticed that out of the total permissible (6,175) as many as 4,726 attended the Congress. Hitherto the number has been swelled by local delegates who could under the old constitution become delegates for the asking by simply paying Rs. 10. This time not even Pandit Malaviyaji could be regarded as a delegate because he was not elected. The actual attendance of 4,726 was therefore a fine record. That the United Provinces and Bengal, in spite of so many arrests, could have sent 888 and 373 respectively and the far off Assam should have sent 17 and Utkal 108, shows the keen interest that is being taken in the National Assembly. No less remarkable is the attendance of 106 lady delegates representing almost all the provinces. The attendance of 65 Sikh delegates must also be regarded as altogether remarkable. Hardly few Sikhs attended two years ago. But now that community is everywhere pushing itself forward in all national movements. The numbers of 469 Musalman delegates is a good number, but we must not be satisfied till we have got the full quota which must be more than 1200. I am sure that there were more than 2 'untouchable' delegates. I cannot imagine the Punjab and the Andhra provinces not sending any such delegates. The presence of 5 Parsi delegates is of course beyond their numerical proportion which is 2. The Parsis, as I have so often remarked, have in proportion to their numbers occupied the foremost place whether in point of sacrifice, attendance, ability or generosity. I know as a matter of fact that there were at least two Christians. And of course, if Messrs. Stokes and George Joseph had been free, they would have attended. But it is up to the Hindus and

the Musalmans to go out of their way to induce a more general interest in the movement on the part of the Christian community.

THE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF SATYAGRAH ASHRAM

OBJECT

The object of this home is to learn how to serve the motherland and to serve it.

DIVISIONS

This home is divided into three classes :—Managers, Candidates and Students.

(1) MANAGERS

Managers believe that, in order to learn how to serve the country, the following observances should be enforced in their own lives, and they have been doing so for some time.

1. THE VOW OF TRUTH

It is not enough that one ordinarily does not resort to untruth ; one ought to know that no deception may be practised even for the good of the country, that Truth may require opposition to one's parents and elders. Consider the example of Prahlad.

2. THE VOW OF AHIMSA (NON-KILLING)

It is not enough not to take the life of any living being. The follower of this Vow may not hurt even those whom he believes to be unjust ; he may not be angry with them, he must love them : thus he would oppose the tyranny whether of parents, governments or others, but will never hurt the tyrant. The follower of Truth and Ahimsa will conquer the tyrant by love, he will not carry out the tyrant's will but he will suffer punishment even unto death for disobeying his will until the tyrant himself is conquered.

3. THE VOW OF CELIBACY

It is well nigh impossible to observe the foregoing two Vows unless celibacy is also observed ; for this vow it is not enough that one does not look upon another woman with a lustful eye, he has so to control his animal passions that they will not be moved even in thought ; if he

is married, he will not have a carnal mind regarding his wife but considering her as his life-long friend, will establish with her the relationship of perfect purity.

4. Control of the Palate

Until one has overcome the pleasures of the palate, it is difficult to observe the foregoing Vows, more especially that of celibacy. Control of the Palate is therefore treated as a separate observance. One desirous of serving the country will believe that eating is necessary only for sustaining the body, he will, therefore, daily regulate and purify his diet and will either gradually or immediately in accordance with his ability leave off such foods as may tend to stimulate animal passions or are otherwise unnecessary.

5. The Vow of Non-stealing

It is not enough not to steal what is commonly considered as other men's property. It is theft if we use articles which we do not really need. Nature provides from day to day just enough and no more for our daily needs.

6. The Vow of Non-possession

It is not enough not to possess and keep much, but it is necessary not to keep anything which may not be absolutely necessary for our bodily wants: thus if one can do without chairs, one should do so. The follower of this vow will, therefore, by constantly thinking thereover simplify his life.

Subsidiary Observances

Two observances are reduced from the foregoing.

1. Swadeshi

It is inconsistent with Truth to use articles about which or about whose makers there is a possibility of deception. Therefore, for instance, a votary of Truth will not use articles manufactured in the mills of Manchester, Germany or India, for he does not know that there is no deception about them. Moreover, labourers suffer much in the mills. Use of fire in the mills causes enormous destruction of life besides killing labourers before their time. Foreign goods and goods made by means of complicated machinery are, therefore, tabooed to a votary of Ahimsa. Further reflection will show that use of such goods will involve a breach of the vows of non-stealing and

non-possession. We wear foreign goods in preference to simple goods made in our own hand looms because custom attributes greater beauty to them. Artificial beautifying of the body is a hindrance to a Brahmachari; he will, therefore, avoid the use of any but the simplest goods. Therefore, the vow of Swadeshi requires the use of simple and simply made clothing to the exclusion of even buttons, foreign cuts, etc., and so will Swadeshi be applied to every department of life.

2. Fearlessness

He who is acted upon by fear can hardly follow Truth or Ahimsa. Managers will, therefore, endeavour to be free from the fear of kings, people, caste, families, thieves, robbers, ferocious animals such as tigers and even death. A truly fearless man will defend himself against others by truth-force or soul-force.

Vernaculars

It is the belief of the managers that no nation can make real progress by abandoning its own languages; they will, therefore, train themselves through the medium of their respective vernaculars and as they desire to be on terms of intimacy with their brethren from all parts of India, they will learn the chief Indian languages, they will learn that also.

Hand Labour

Managers believe that body labour is a duty imposed by nature upon mankind. We may, therefore, resort to bodily labour alone for our sustenance and use our mental and spiritual powers for the common good only, and as the largest percentage in the world lives upon agriculture, managers will devote some part of their time to working on the land: and when such is not possible, perform some other bodily labour.

Hand Looms

Managers believe that one of the chief causes of poverty in the land is the virtual disappearance of cotton-spinning wheels and hand looms. They will, therefore, make a great effort to revive this industry by working upon hand looms themselves.

Politics

Politics, economic progress, etc., are not considered to be independent branches of learning but that they are all rooted in religion.

An effort will, therefore, be made to learn Politics, Economics, Social Reform, etc., in a religious spirit, and work in connection with these matters will be taken up by the managers with energy and devotion.

(2) CANDIDATES

Those who are desirous of following out the foregoing programme but they are not able immediately to take the necessary vows may be admitted as candidates. It is obligatory upon them to conform to the observances referred to above, though they do not take the vows, whilst they are in the Ashram and they will occupy the status of managers, when they are able to take the necessary vows.

(3) STUDENTS

1. Any children whether boys or girls from four years and upwards may be admitted.

2. Parents will have to surrender all control over their children.

3. Children may not be permitted to visit their parents until the whole course of study is finished.

4. Students will be taught to observe all the vows observable by the managers.

5. They will be taught principles of religion, agriculture, hand loom weaving and literature.

6. Literary knowledge will be imparted through the respective vernaculars of the students and will include History, Geography, Mathematics, Economics, etc., learning of Sanskrit. Hindi and at least one Dravidian Vernacular is obligatory.

7. English will be taught as a second language.

8. They will be taught Urdu, Bengali, Tamil, Telugu and Devanagiri characters.

9. Managers believe that the whole course will be completed in ten years. Upon reaching the age of majority, students will be given the option of taking the vows referred to in section I or retire from the Ashram, if its programme has not commended itself to them.

10. This option they will exercise when no longer they will require the assistance of their parents or other guardians.

11. Every endeavour will be made to teach the students from the very beginning not to have the fear, "what shall I do for my maintenance if and when I become an independent man."

12. Grown up persons also may be admitted as students.

13. As a rule the simplest and the same style of clothing will be worn by all.

14. Food will be simple. Chillies will be excluded altogether and no condiments will be used generally except salt, pepper and turmeric. Milk and its products being a hindrance to a celebate life and milk being often a cause of tuberculosis, and having the same stimulating qualities as meat will be most sparingly used if at all. Food will be served thrice. In it dried and fresh fruits will be liberally used. All in the Ashram will be taught principles of Hygiene.

15. There will be no vacation in this Ashram and no holidays as a rule, but during 1½ days per week the ordinary routine will be altered and students will have leisure to attend to their private personal work.

16. During 3 months in the year those whose health permits will be enabled to travel mostly on foot in the different parts of India.

17. No fees will be charged either against students or candidates but parents or members themselves will be expected to contribute as much as they can towards the expenses of the Ashram.

MISCELLANEOUS

The management will be controlled solely by the managers. The chief manager will control all admissions. The expenses of conducting the Ashram are being met from moneys already received by the chief manager and being received from friends who are more or less believers in this Ashram. The Ashram is situated in 2 houses on the banks of the Sabarmati, Ahmedabad. It is expected that in a few months about 100 acres of ground will be acquired for locating the Ashram thereon.

Visitors are requested during their stay at the Ashram to observe as nearly as possible the rules of the Ashram. Every endeavour will be made to make them comfortable; but they will confer upon the management a favour if they will bring with them their bedding and eating utensils. Those parents who intend sending their children to the Ashram are advised to visit the Ashram. No children will be admitted without being thoroughly examined as to their mental and moral condition.

INDEX

A — Page

Abdul Bari on cow question and Khilafat... 142
" , Defence of Lucknow speech of ... 265
Abuse, What is ... 211
Advertisements ... 3
Advice, A woman's ... 581
Afghan alarm, Reply to Pal —*See* also *Frontier* ... 724
Afghan invasion, Andrews on ... 718
" , Danger of 713
" , Mahomed Ali on ... 716
Agreed Statement of " Gandhi and Reading ... 1107
" , Gandhi on... 1110
Ahimsa, limits of—*See* also *Non-violence* 661, 1086
Ajmal Khan, Agra Disturbances and... 401
" , Gandhi's letter from prison to 1057
" , Qurbani, cow Question and 408
" , Reply to Gandhi of ... 1061
Ali Brothers, Agreed Statement about... 1107
" , Appeal to Muslims on arrest of ... 1110
" , Apology of... 1101
" , Arrest of ... 891

Page

Ali Brothers, Gandhi's Defence of ... 1105
" , Indian Republic and ... 879
" , Life in Jail of 1123
Aligarh, Appeal to College Trustees of ... 378
" , Appeal to Parents of Boys of ... 381
Amritsar Appeals ... 92
Andhradesa, Awakening in 972
" , Non-payment of Taxes in... 947
" , Non-payment and Government measures 975
" , Preparedness for Civil Disobedience in 625
" , Progress of Khaddar Production in ... 540
Andrews, C. F., Burning of cloth and... 556
" , Coolies of Assam and 748
" , Gandhi—Reading Interview and 744
" , Indian Independence and 880
" , Difficulty of re: Khilafat Question ... 605
Arrest, Ali Brothers' ... 891
" , Banker's ... 1036

Page

Arrest, Gandhi's in 1919 ... 14
" " 1922 ... 1039
" " advantages of 1036
" , Leaders' ... 901
" , Procedure for followers on 1028, 1031
Association, Freedom of—
See under *Freedom* ...
Authority, Reason *vs.* ... 483
" Vedas' ... 801

B

Banker, S. G., Arrest of ... 1039
" , Connection with *Young India* of ... xxii
" , Hakimji on... 1061
" , Judgment against ... 1056
" , Statement before Court 1054
" Trial of ... 1043
Bardoli, Preparations of re: Civil Disobedience 940
" , Decision of re: Civil Disobedience ... 962
" , Gandhi's Letter to Viceroy re: decision of ... 966
" Resolutions ... 1019
" , " , defence of 1002, 1141
" , " , reply to Kelkar on 1009
" , " , reply to Impatient Muslims on 1007
Begar, Stokes, S.E., on ... 745
Behari Lal Sachdeva, the case of ... 76
Bengal, Letter to Young ... 391
" , Warning re: Non-payment of taxes from ... 981
Besant, Mrs., Hindi language and ... 444
" , Services to India of... 444

Page

Betting, the Curse of ... 812
" , Manu on ... 814
" , "Satya" on racing and ... 814
Bezwada Programme ... 647
Bhai Paramanand, the case of ... 79
Bihar Director of Industries, Reply to on Swadesi ... 539
Bihar Publicity Bureau on Cloth Boycott ... 538
Bolshevism, India and ... 279
Bombay Riots ... 279
" , Gandhi's Account of... 1153
" , Gandhi's Appeals to Citizens, Mavalies, and Co-workers 1157
Botha, General, N. C. O. of... 244
Boycott, a subterfuge ... 136
" , a form of violence... 487
" , How to effect cloth 513, 553
" , Non-co-operation and 139, 147
" , not constructive ... 487
" , not an Eastern method ... 487
" , Reply to Kasturiranga Iyengar on 487
" , Reply to Bihar Publicity Bureau ... 538
" , Reply to Coubrough, A. C., on ... 547
" , Rouses Party feeling 487
" , Social—*See* under *Social Boycott*... 397
" , Success of depends on universal acceptance ... 487
" , Swadesi and—*See* also *Swadesi* ... 487
" , unpracticable as it involves heavy sacrifice ... 487
Brahmacharya, Importance of 70, 734, 1093
" , Rules to faci-

Page

litate observance of ... 1097
Brahmins, Non - Brahmins and—*See* also *Non-Brahmins* 424
" , Political ascendency of ... 420
" , their Duty re: Non-Brahmin question ... 428
British Committee of the Congress—*See* Foreign Propaganda ...
British Committee of the Congress, Miss Normanton on ... 837
British Rule in India, Defects of ... 225
" , Dr. Pollen on 623
" , Reply to Pennington 126
" , *vs.* other Governments ... 1088
Bugga, the Case of ... 82

C

Candler, Edmund, Open letter to Gandhi of 162, 397
Caste, a Saviour of Hinduism 480
" , a wholesome custom —*See*also *Hinduism* 397
" , Democracy and ... 480
" , Hereditary Principle in ... 481
" , Inter-dining and inter-marriage in ... 481
" , Occupation and ... 482
" , Reason and ... 483
" , Reply to Critics of ... 479
" , Sub-division of reprehensible ... 480
" , Untouchability and ... 482
" , vs. Caste system ... 481
Charka, Committee of ladies to revive use of ... 502
" , Economic value of 524
" , Handloom *vs.* the 532

Page

Charka, Improvements in ... 503
" , In Islam ... 498
" , In Praise of—*See* also *Spinning* ... 497
" , In the Gita 499, 675
" , Reply to Tagore on. 669
" , Tests of a good ... 587
" , Uses of by Queens in Ancient India ... 499
Chauri Chaura, the Crime of. 993
" , Congress work after ... 1142
Chelmsford, Lord, Mrs. Naidu's allegations and ... 131
" , Lord, Reply to the Council speech of 133, 572
" , Lord, the Khilafat Deputations and ... 143
" , Lord, Responsbility for the Punjab tragedy of ... 106
Civil Disobedience Aggressive and defensive 916, 983
" , Complete *vs.* Partial ... 933
" , Conditions of 932
" , Fight for elementary rights and ... 914
" , First suspension of 23, 32
" , Individual, when permissible ... 935
" , Lawlessness and ... 33
" , Mrs. Besant and ... 38
" , Nonviolence and ... 59
" , Number of workers required for ... 935
" , Patel and

Page

Kanunga's pure 854, 930
Civil Disobedience, Satyagraha Sabha and 14
„ , the Delhi Resolution on 291, 854
„ , Thoreau on 931, 950
„ , *Young India's* ... 57
Civil *vs.* Criminal 936, 943
„ , When a sacred duty 938
„ , Mass *vs.* Individual.
„ , Area of operation for. 938
„ , Need for peace in Non C.D. Areas ... 98
„ , Readiness of Bardoli for ... 940
„ , Precautions to be taken in ... 944
„ , Taxes refusal and *See* under *Taxes*
„ , Danger of precipitating Mass ... 947
„ , Need for continuance of defensive ... 971
„ , Calcutta's unreadiness for ... 982
„ , Aggressive, when permissible ... 987
„ , Triple boycott and ... 988
„ , Essence of ... 989
„ , Abandonment of even Defensive ... 1016
„ , Preparedness of Andhra desa for ... 1025
„ , Reply to Viceroy on... 1147
„ , Gandhi's letter to Viceroy on ... 966
Clemes C. W., Interview with Gandhi of ... 48
Cloth, Foreign, Boycott of—*See* under Boycott
„ , Foreign, Burning of 553, 657
„ , „ in Bombay ... 554
„ , „ Destruction, of, distinguished from that of other goods ... 554
„ , „ Ethics of destruction of... 555

Page

Cloth, „ Reply to Mr. Andrews on the burning of foreign 556
„ , problem in India-See also Swadesi and Spinning 490, 505
Colleges, Aligarh, Appeal to Trustess of ... 378
„ , Boycott of See Schools and National Education 377
„ , Not representative of ancient culture ... 380
„ , Sin to continue to study in the ... 381
Congress, All—India Committee of ... 852
„ , Amritsar ... 819
„ , Committee of See also Foreign propaganda 859, 837
„ , Bulletin ... 797
„ , Calcutta Special... 829
„ , Constitution 821, 823, 842, 1160
„ , Indian States and 840, 848
„ , Muslim apathy to. 413
„ , Nagpur 839, 840
„ , Non-violence and 287
„ , Non-co-operation and 831, 857
„ , Not to be a fetish. 864
Proceedings in Hindustani at 445, 820
„ , Provincial Committee, Draft Rules for ... 1167
„ , Reforms and in 1919 823, 826
„ , Resolution and bloodshed ... 848
„ , Resolutions, force of as mandate ... 865
„ , Resolutions, See sketch of the Non-co-operation Movement

Page

Congress, Slackness of the work of ... 957
" , Three classes in 859
" , Waste on Pandals for ... 822
" , Working Committee of ... 849
" , Working of the new Constitution of ... 1169
" , Undesirability of lengthy addresses at ... 821
" , Experience vs. 547, 1141 638
Coubrough, A.C., Reply to
" , on Piecegoods trade ... 547
" , Boycott of See also Voters 333, 342, 341
Councils, Boycott C. R. Chari on ... 344
" , Boycott, Lajpat Rai on ... 341
" , What they cannot do ... 345
Councils, What they can do. 345
" , Disillusionment Re: ... 340
" , Electorates and the members of 348
" , General Botha and Boycott of ... 346
" , Obstruction Tactics in ... 343
" , Success of boycott of ... 347
Courts, Boycottof See also Law and Lawyers... 335
" , Sonduct of defendants before ... 364
" , Conflict of authority in ... 358
" , Corruption and Demoralisation in 350 361
" , Delay of justice in ... 3553
" , Economic drain of 352, 351
" , Failure of Justice in 350, 36
" , Hallucination of ... 349
" , High Traditions and record of ... 360
Courts, Indian Judges, no safeguard in ... 350
" , Inequality between Indians and Europeans in 350, 354
" , Lawyers' High Fees in 352, 356, 360
" , Mainstay of Government ... 350
" , Motilal Ghose on boycott of ... 369
" , Motilal Nehru on ... 359
" , Object of Boycott by Lawyers ... 369
" , Panchayat contrasted with 352, 356, 360
" , Rajendra Prasad on 353
" , Subjection to the Executive of ... 362
" , The "Patrika" on the boycott of ... 365
" , Touts in ... 358
Cow question & Khilafat 141, 413
" , Ajmal Khan on 408
" , Folly of compulsion in ... 412
" , Goshalas and 411
" , Hindu cruelty in ... 409
" , Municipal atcion and ... 410
" , Qurbani and 407
" , Significance of 804
" , Vegetarianism and ... 412
" , How to tackle and 410, 805

D

Dadabhai Naoroji, Aid to Gandhi of ... 429
Das, C. R., Arrest of ... 429
" , Calcutta Congress and ...
Darshan, a source of indiscipline ... 316
Death, Fear of ... 898

Page

Declaration of rights, Futility of ... 115
Defence in Courts—*See* ... under *Courts* Gandhi and 654
" of India if Britain evacuates ... 713
Delhi Resolutions on C. Disobedience ... 854
" A. I. C.C. Meeting at on Bardoli Programme ... 1011, 1018
Demonstrations, Conditions of usefulness of ... 329
" , organisation of ... 320
" , Undesirability of nocturnal 329
Depressed Classes, Congress and the 467, 469
" , Conversion to Christianit of ... 465
" , Education of the ... 642
" , Government and and ... 465
" , Gandhi's address at Conference of ... 471
" , Hindusim, and ... 807
" , Pradhan, R. G., on 466
" , Treatment of... 464
" use of Non-co-operation for ... 466
Desai, Mahadeo, On the economics of spinning ... 521
Dharwad, Stone-throwing at 304 1127

Page

Dharwad Hooliganism at ... 304
Dhurna, Sitting 298, 1076
Dhurna Sitting Contrasted with picketting ... 1127
Direct action, Success of *See* also *Civil Disobedience* ... 569
Discipline, Need for *See* also *Indiscipline* 315, 326
Disorders Ahmedabad 15, 36
Disorders Bombay Government and 16, 45
Disorders, Delhi ... 14
Disorders Punjab—*See* under *Punjab*
Distress warrants, how to face them— ... 1080
Divorce of Co-operator Husband by Non-co-operator wife ... 902
Divorce and Islam ... 902
Douglas, Secession of Mr. ... 264
Dravidian Civilisation *vs.* ... Brahmin ... 425
Dravidians and Hindi ... 447
Duke of Connaught, Gandhi's letter to ... 706
Dukhobars as Non-co-operations ... 245
Durgadas Adwani ... 45
Dyer, General, Army Council and ... 121
" , General, Congress Enquiry Report and 112, 106
" , General, Hunter Committee and Government See Jallianwala decision on ... 113
" , General, Pennington's Defence of ... 123
" , proposed impeachment of ... 119

E

Eating, method and Importance of ... 397
Economics, Indian, Reply to

Page

Coubrough ... 547
Economics, Indian, Capitalism and ... 430
" , Indian, Parsis and ... 430
" , Indian, Market Law and ... 656
" , Indian, Ethics and ... 672
Education, Ability to earn while learning and ... 396
" , Backwardness of in India ... 395
" , Bombay Departments Circular on ... 808
" , Boer example in ... 305
" , Bolshevik example in national and ... 395
Education, Defects of present—See also Schools and National Education ... 386,
" , English ... 457
" , High Cost of ... 394
" , Hunting after Careers and 386, 394,
" , Place of literary training in ... 397
" , Spinning and ... 396
Empire, Conflict of loyalty to with loyalty to 810
" , Is it based on Force 808, 811
" , What it means to India 578, 808
Employees and Khaddar ... 1091
English, an "unmitigated evil" ... 454
" , Education ... 457
" , Reply to Tagore about ... 459
" , Reply to Sir John Woodroffe 461
" , The place of—See also under Hidustani ... 454

Page

Englishman, letter to every I ... 576
" , letter to every II ... 943
" , Call for the support of in Swadesi and temperance work ... 636
English lady, Blessing of an ... 956
Europe, christianity and ... 237
European, stoning of ... 280

F

Famine, Insurance, Spinning as 505, 531
" , Relief, Mrs. J. Petit on ... 527
" , Relief, in Ceded Districts ... 532
Fasting, ... 53
" , as cleansing ... 999
" , when to be public and when secret 1000
" , when not permissible ... 999
Flag, National, ... 436
" , P. Venkayyas' design of ... 437
" , Spinning wheel as emblem in 431
" , The Sikhs and the ... 463
Foreign Propaganda, *Congress Bulletin* for ... 797
" , Congress Working Committee on ... 796
" , Dishonest methods of ... 796
" , Fultility of... 796
" , Incompatible with Non-co-operations 795, 799

Page

Foreign Propaganda, *India* and... 794
" , Report of Gandhi on... 797
" , Tilak on ... 797
Freedom of opinion, Manifesto on... 895
" , and its expression... 896
Freedom Speech and Association, Attack on ... 943
Freemantle, A. F., Reply to Gandhi of... 662
" , A. F. Reply of Gandhi to ... 666
Freemasonary, Political ... 110
Frontier, Failure of British policy in the ... 723
" , Hindu-Muslim Unity and troubles in the ... 721
" , History of the ... 722
" , How to deal with the ... 719
" , Kidnapping on the 721
" , Physical Force and the ... 720
" , Reliance on British bullet in ... 721
" , the Tribes of the 719

G

Gandhi, M. K., Advice of to the Suppressed classes... 964
" , Abuse of the name of ... 1092
" , Allegiance to King George 701
" , Arrest of ... 1039
" , Bogus daughter of ... 979
" , Bombay Riots and—*See* also *Bombay Riots* ... 1153
" , Biographical note of—See also Statement in Court on trial ... 577
Gnadhi, M. K., Desire of to be born an untouchable 457
" , Difference between Tilak and 784, 786, 788
" , Expert member of Non-co-operation Committee .. 201
" , Favourite Books of ... 49
" , Feelings for his wife ... 806
" , Gokhale and 787
" , Hinduism and 806
" , Interview of with Reading 604
" , If the son of were prosecuted ... 654
" , Inconsistency of ... 658
" , Indian leaders and ... 783
" , Judgment against ... 1044
" , Khilafat and 150, 151, 159, 201
" , Krishna and 566
" , Letter to Viceroy on Non-co-operation ... 197
" , Letter to Viceroy inaugurating N. C. O. ... 219
Letter to Viceroy re: Bardoli ... 969
" , Message of Mrs. ... 1066

Page

Gandhi, M. K., Mahatmaship and ... 652
" , messenger of God ... 566
" , Neither a Saint nor a politician ... 565
" , Not a perfect man ... 1792
" , On talk of suicide by... 791
" , on founding a sect ... 567
" , Reasons of for taking part in politics 668
" , Reforms in 1919 and ... 826
" , Reply of to Government Communique 1147
" , Speech on Message of Punjab of ... 75
Gandhi, M. K., Statement before Court of ... 1047
Gandhi, M. K., Trial of ... 1043
Gaol, *See Jail*
George, Pledge of Mr. Lloyd 164
George, King. and Gandhi... 701
Ghose, Motilal on Boycott of Courts ... 369
Gillespie, Rev. Mr., on Christ and Non-co-operation ... 241
Godrej, Contribution of to Tilak Swaraj Fund ... 429
Gokhale, Gandhi and ... 787
Government, Duty to in man with Afghanistan ... 718
" , Non-co-operation of with Congress ... 1072
" , Non-co-operation not anti 640, 644
" , Paralysing ... 599
" of India, Campaign of against Swadesi ... 1090
" of India Communique of on Bardoil letter ... 1144
Government of India, Non-co-operation and ... 271
" of India, Responsibility of for Khilafat

H

Hartal, 6th April, 1919 ... 13
" , Abuse of ... 275
" , Allahabad ... 915
" , an outlet for disciplined feeling ... 257
" , Calcutta ... 915
" , Nature of ... 21
" Objects of ... 23
" , Satyag raha and... 34
Heron, Order of on the hurrying up of martial law underarrests ... 96
Hindu Muslim Unity—
Hindu Muslim Unity ... 138
Ajmal Khan on ... 1057
Unity and Cow question—See Cow question advent Before British ... 401
How best promoted ... 399
In case of dissolution of... 1075
Inter dining and marrying not essential for ... 397
In Bihar ... 408
Khialfat and ... 154
Means nationality as a whole 405 384
Moplah Outbreak and ... 415
No camouflage ... 418
Music before mosques and 406
Mutual toleration essential for ... 400
Isolated violence no obstacle to 416, ... 420
Basis of goodness of human nature ... 422
Non-co-operation and ... 400
Religious injunctions and 404
Satyagraha and ... 7
And Qurbani ... 407
Hindu Swaraj—A reply to attacks on ... 866

Page

Hinduism, and eating ... 397
" , and Caste—See also Caste 397, 479
" , and intermarriage 397
" , Cow protection, the central fact in 804
" , How to deal with untouchability in 470, 807
" , Meaning of Sanatana ... 801
" , Untouchability no part of 465, 473
Hindustani, as national language ... 445
" , Congress and ... 445
" , Contrasted with English as national language 447, 449, 454
" , Reply to critics about 454, 457
" , Widespread use of ... 446
Home Rule League, Appeal to Members of... 60
" , Programme for 61
Hooliganism, opposed to democracy See also Discipline 304
Humility, the need for ... 277
Hunter Committee, Gandhi's statement before 11
" , Gandhi's replies to President of 16
" , Gandhi to Justice Rankin before ... 31
" , Gandhi to air C Setalwad before 33
" , Gandhi to Jagat Narhin ... 41
" , Gandhi to Kemp 45
" , Indian Secretary's Despatch on ... 111
" , Minority Report 112
" , Majority Report of ... 111
" , Non-co-operation of Congress leaders with ... 112

Page

I

Imprisonment, Hardships in 1107
" when to shun 1060
India, Discontinuance of—*See* also Foreign propaganda ... 794
India, Inefficient conduct of 838
" , Miss Normanton on 837
Indian Decay, Cause of ... 1088
Indian Home Rule See Hind Swaraj ...
Indians, Shortcomings of ... 624
Indian States and Congress 840, 1534
Indian Witness Gandhi interviewed of for... 48
" , Independence—*See* Republic ...
Indisciplinc—*See* also Discipline ... 315
Indiscipline, A menace to the public ... 327
" Some Illustrations of ... 322
" not essential for unity 397, 481
Intermarriage, not essential for unity 398, 481
Ireland and India, Reply to Mr. Churchill 293
" , Reply to Lord Reading 612
Islam and forced conversions ... 415

J

Jails, Ali Brothers' life in ... 1121
" , Civil Disobedience in, when justifiable ... 183
" , Conduct in ... 1111
" , Discipline in 1118, 1121
" , Shaukat Ali's suggestions for Non-co-operators in ... 1125
" , Under Swaraj 1118, 1122

Page

Jails, Work in ... 1117
„ , What a model prisoner should do in ... 1120
Jallianwalah Bagh—*See* also Genereal Dyer ... 101
„ Bagh, Meaning of ... 102
Jallianwalah Bagh, Proposed purchase of ... 102
Jamiatsingh Bugga, of the case ... 77
Jayakar on Non-co-operation ... 860
Jhajjar, Municipality and Town Hall of ... 959
Johnson, Col. Frank ... 123

K

Kalelkar, D. B., on Tilak ... 788
Kasur incident ... 86
Kasturiranga Iyengar, Reply to on boycott ... 487
Kasturiranga Iyengar, on Reforms 826, 830
Kelkar, N. C., and Bardoli Programme ... 1009
Kelkar, N. C., on picketing 1129
Khaddar as standard cloth for India 1490, 494
„ , Abuse of by Khaddar wearers ... 520
„ , Bhandar, How to manage a ... 511
„ , How to fight fraudulent imitations of ... 534
„ , How to deal with shortage of ... 537
„ , in marriage ... 497
„ , in temples ... 498
„ , Mrs. Mohani on... 495
„ , Organisation of productions of ... 534
„ , Prices of at Satyagraha Ashram ... 493
„ , Progress of production of in Andradesa ... 540

Page

Kelkar, N.C., Bihar ... 540
„ , Propaganda of Mrs. Chaudharni... 508
„ , Saris made of ... 491
„ , Sacred associations of ... 492
„ , Uses of ... 492
„ , use of a measure of readiness to sacrifice ... 507
, Why the fashion should be altered... 496
„ , Mahatmaji to Hakimij on importance of ... 1059
Khadi—*S*ee Khaddar
Khilafat, Allabahad decision Re: ... 191
„ , Conference at Delhi ... 137
„ , Cow question and 141
„ , Day 134, 255
„ , Deputation and Viceroy ... 143
„ , Deputation and Gandhi's telegram to ... 144
„ , Demands ... 144
„ , Difficulties about cleared ... 168
„ , Gandhi's reply to S. Africa about... 150
„ , Gandhi's reply to Englishman ... 150
„ , Government of India Communique on ... 159
„ , Hindus and 138, 150, 154
„ , Muslim impatience about ... 182
„ , Muslim representation to Viceroy re: ... 202
„ , Reply to Candler 162
„ , Satyagraha the only remedy for... 147
„ , Swaraj and ... 183
„ , Swadesi and ... 506
„ , The meaning of... 186

Page

Khilafat, What must not be done to get redress in ... 147
„ , What must be done to get redress in ... 148
Kirpans, and Non-violence 296
Kisan Movement, Its possibilities and dangers—See also Labour ... 741
Kisan Movement, Instructions to U. P. ... 742
„ Movement, Rent nonpayment to zamindars in ... 952
Krishnanand, Swami, Karachi and ... 280

L

Labour, Indian, a European on ... 630
„ , Abuse of strikes by—See also Strikes 730, 732
„ , Agricultural —See under Kisans ...
„ , Arbitration and ... 730
„ , As pawn of politicians 730
„ , Child and women ... 733
„ , Dangers of friends of 730
„ , Development of moral faculty of ... 733
„ , European maltreatment of ... 633
„ , How to solve the problem of 729
„ , Inefficiency of Indian... 732

Page

Labour, Indian, in Assam 630, 744
„ , Need for Unions of 731
„ , Self-Improvement best political action of... 737
„ , Stokes on forced Simla 745
„ , Use of increased wages
„ , Western methods of agitation of 728
Lajpat Rai, Arrest of ... 901
„ , on Boycott of Councils ... 341
„ , Moderates and... 309
Language, Hindi as national —See under Hindustani 445
Law, Motilal Nehru on ... 362
„ , Rajendra Prasad on... 353
„ , vs. Justice 354, 358
„ , what the Profession of means—See also Courts ... 353
Lawyers, as volunteers 372, 1078
„ , Congress and 365, 369
„ , Deterioration in tone of ... 360
„ , Duty of ... 335
„ , Duties of practising lawyers ... 370
„ , Jamalal Fund for 372
„ , Leadership and ... 370
„ , Motilal Nehru's appeal to ... 362
„ , Varma's protest re: ... 367
„ , vs. merchants ... 365
Leadership, Lawyers and ... 371
„ Qualities of ... 370
„ When to relinquish 794, 1141
Leitner, Dr., Qurbani ... 407
Litigation, Evils of—See under Courts and lawyers

M Page

Macfarlane, the Rev. G.H., on Non-co-operation ... 1084
Machinery, Attitude of Gandhi to 517, 654
Madras, Appeal to on Hindi 244
Maharashtra Party and Congress ... 856
" Party Conference of ... 860
Mahatma, Is Gandhi a ... 652
of ... 732
Majorities, the law of ... 207
" , the duty of ... 831
Malaviya and Amritsar Congress 824, 827
" , Conference or Round Table Conference ... 921
" , Conflict of duties of Govind ... 1082
" , Deputation of to Viceroy on arrests ... 918
" , Discovery of police order by 99
" , on Non-co-operation ... 857
Malik Khan, Punjab Atrocities and ... 123
Marriage, a fall as birth ... 803
" , Place of in Hinduism ... 803
Married, Duty of the in India ... 1094
Marsden, Kasur incident and ... 86
Martial Law prosecutions, hurrying up of ... 102
Mass Movement, Dangers of —*See* also Civil Disobedience 978
" , Impostures in ... 978
Meetings, Disturbance at ... 306
" , Method of expressing dissent at ... 308
Mehta, P. M. and Gandhi, ... 786
Mills, Attitude of Gandhi to ... 517
Mills, Comparative capacity of handspinning and spinning in ... 524
" , Dependence on foreign machinery for ... 510
" , No solution of cloth-of problem—*See* also under Swadesi and spinning ... 486
" , Difficulty of establishing 486, 490
Mills, No use in distribution of savings ... 486
" , No use as subsidiary industry ... 486
" , Not damaged by spinning ... 505
" , Sir Charles Macara on ... 490
" Statistics of production by looms and in ... 513
Millhands, Gandhi's address to—*See* also Labour ... 731
Millowners, Duty of ... 515
Minority, Duty of Congress ... 832
" , Freedom of ... 1076
Mobocracy, *vs.* Democracy .. 314
" , Some illustrations of ... 322
Moderates, Gandhi's letter to ... 432
" , Gandhi's Compatibility of with Non-co-operation 1074
Mohani, Hasrat, on Indian Republic ... 881
Mohani, Mrs., on Khaddar
Montagu, the Punjab and ... 86
" , Threat of re: Khilafat agitation 174
" , *vs.* Mrs. Naidu .. 128
Moplah rising, Meaning of 675, 1148
Motilal Nehru, on Courts—*See* Courts and Law ... 359
Municipalities add National Education... 769

Page

Municipalities, Electorates and ... 770
„ , Government Highhandedness to... 777
„ , Indiffereace to public opinion of... 770
„ , Jhajjar, Town Hall and Congress 959
„ , Khaddar and Raipur ... 772
„ , Khaddar and Lahore ... 773
„ , Lawrence Statue motto and Lahore 779
„ , Picketing of liquor shops by Thana ... 771
„ , the Case of Nadiad ... 762
„ , Total prohibition and Nagpur ... 772
„ , Unwilling Chrala and Pairala and its ... 775
„ , Supersession of and the electorate's duty ... 777
Muslims, apathy of to Congress and Swaraj 413
„ , Appeal to on Ali Brothers' arrest 1110
„ , Deficiency in education of ... 415
„ , In case of secession of ... 1075

N

Naidu Mrs. *vs.* Montague ... 128
„ viceroy on allegation of 131 ... 151
National cries ... 442

Page

National education—*See* also Education and Schools ... 338
„ education Need for 386
„ education, Ideals of 396
„ flag—*See* also under Flag ... 436
„ University at Gujerat ... 304
„ University a centre of Indian culture 384
„ Week 53, 57, 63
Nava Jinan, popularity and policy of ... 2, 5
„ , Why Government should not suppress.. 1034
Negation, Value of ... 611
Nehru, Motilal, on Courts ... 356
Newspapers, Possible need for handwritten
Non-Brahmins, Brahmins and —See also Brahmins... 422
„ , Complaints of ... 425
„ , Dravidian Civilisation of ... 424
„ , Suicidal policy of... 427
,Satanic treatment of by Brahmins... 468
Non-co-operation,—
Allahabad Decision Re: 191
And lawyers, see under Courts
And Education—See Schools
As a remedy for Indian shortcomings ... 605
A planter on ... 630
Abuse or violence of words prohibited not permissible in 210, 211
Boycott and 130, 741
Civil Disobedience and ... 174
Calcutta Conference and 150

Page

Non-co-operation,—
Co-operative Societies and 583
Committee ... 333
Christ and ... 239
Co-operation & ... 223
Christians and ... 984
Conduct at Opponent's meetings ... 306
Congress and ... 857
Conscience, expedience and ... 649
Conditions for giving up ... 887
Delhi Conference adopts 137
Distinguished from Civil Disobedience Satyagraha, and Passive Resistance... 221
Dwijendranath Tagore on 251, 261
Destructive and constructive ... 647
Debate in Indian legislature on ... 952
Effect on language and literatwe ... 689
Effects of 692, 685, 689 878, 1085
Government of India and 271
General Botha and ... 244
How to work Non-co-operation ... 191
Incom- plete Non-co-operators and ... 393
Inwardness of ... 234
Inner meaning of ... 244
Inauguration of 213, 219, with Congress ... 1072
Independenee of the Press and ... 1100
Letter to Viceroy re: ... 197
Lord Chelmsford on ... 572
Letter to Englishman on 576, 634
Muslims and ... 172
Move towards ... 69
Scope and functions of moderates and ... 433
Moral values of ... 249
Municipalitips and —See also Municipality ... 769

Page

Non-co-operation,—
Miss Normanton on ... 876
Need for humility in ... 277
Not directed against capitalists ... 604
Not-Anti-Government 640, 644
Occasion for ... 212
Purity of ... 204
Primary object of ... 599
Probable course of ... 596
Principles of ... 219
Programme of ... 333
Purifying effect of ... 685
Reply to Dr. Sapru re: ... 209
Reply to a Sind friend ... 583
Reply to a woman ... 581
Riza Ali on suspension of 590
Reply to Sir William Vincent ... 599
Reply to Lord Reading 605
Reply to Chandavarkar re: 239, 246
Religion and 239, 246
Reply to an Englishman on progress of ... 639
Reply to Swadesamitran 641
Reply to Freemantle on... 666
Reply to P. Richard on 679, 683, 715, ... 1071
Reply to Stokes ... 713
Reply to Wedgwood ... 886
Reply to Lord Ronaldshay 914
Reply to Govt. Communique after Bardoli on 1147
Scope and functions of Committee of ... 195
Sikh and ... 422
Swadesi and ... 506
Sanyas and ... 223
Suffering and ... 230
Toleration in ... 373
Titles and honours and —See Title ... 337
Times of India on suspension of 591, 593
Theory and Practice of ... 221
Tolstoy and ... 252
Use of Government Libraries ... 583

Page

Non-violence, as policy 262, 282
„ , Alleged failureof ... 289
„ , and Association with those who believe in Violence 661, 1085
„ , Congress and 287
„ , Civil Disobedience and ... 291
„ , Dr. Rajan on 263
„ , Even under provocation 294, 764
„ , goâl of mankind ... 286
„ , in words—See also abuse 210, 211
„ , If India gives up ... 584
„ , Limited ... 289
„ , Reply to Paul Richard on ... 679
„ , Self - defence and ... 1075
„ , Triumph of ... 217
„ , The message of the plains 285

O

O' Brien, Martial Law atrocities of ... 120
O' Dwyer, Anna ... 90
„ , Congress Enquiry Report and ... 106
O'Dwyer, Sir Michal, Dismissal recommended 106
„ , Hunter Committee and 114
„ , Proposed impeachment of 119

P Page

Painter, Mr., How to receive 1079
Pal, B. C., on Pan-Islamism 724
„ , Resolution of at Calcutta Congrsss ... 830
Panchayat, Executve opposition to—See also courts 363
Pan-Islamism ... 180
„ , Reply to Pal on-See also Afghan invasion ... 724
Parents, relation of to 382, 1082
Parsis, Letter to the ... 428
Party organisations, Gandhi's views on .. 1076
Patel, V. J., Pure Civil Disobeidience of ... 930
„ , Vithalbhai, Address of at Bardoli Conference ... 963
Patriotism, Religiou and ... 584
„ , vs. Humanity ... 646
Peaca Celebrations, Khila-
„ , fat hud 138
„ , Bunjab
„ , and 140, 141
Pennington, J.B., Defence of General Dyer by... 123
„ , On British Rule ... 126
Pensions, Contrast in payment of Indian and European ... 1092
Peterson, Miss, Letter to Gandhi on ... 234
Petit, Mrs. J., on spinning as famine relief ... 527
Phillips, G.E., Reply to Gandhi of ... 576
Picketing ... 1124
„ , Contrasted with sitting Dhurma... 1127
„ , The Righs of ... 1129
Placard, a lying ... 623
Police, Position of Ineian ... 1083
„ , Conference ... 1083
Political Freemasonry ... 110

Page

Popley, H.A., Reply to Gandhi ... 576
Poverty, Indian—See Indian Economics also ... 1090
Prakasam, Report of on Andhra Civil Disobedience ... 1025
Prayer ... 57
Press Act in India ... 1099
" , Liberty of the—See also Newspapers ... 944
Prince, Boycott of, Reply to Baptista 697, 710
" , Andrews on abuse of ... 701
" , Compelling welcome to ... 901
" , Difference between the position and person of ... 712
" , Extravagance in visit of ... 710
" , How to honour the.. 709
" , Loyalty to 698, 699
" , Visit of and Repression ... 711
Prisoner, a model—See also Jails ... 1120
Protection, no substitute for spinning ... 485
" , will not provide subsidiary industry ... 485
Punjab Atrocities, Congress Enquiry Report on 106
" , Mrs. Naidu and Montagu on ... 128
" , Message of the—See also Hunter Report ... 69
" , Non-co-operation only remedy for ... 117
" , Peace Celebrations and 140, 141
" , Sentences ... 101
" , Spinning in ... 488

Page

Q

Qurbani, Ajmal Khan on ... 408
" , Dr. Leitner on ... 407

R

Racial inequality in India, Reading on ... 614
" , in law 350, 365, 616
" , "John Bull" on 624
Railway journey, Ghiand on his ... 652
" , If Government refused use of ... 1072
Rajagopalachari on Council Boycott ... 344
Rajendra Prasad, Sktech of Non-co-operation by ... xxv
" , Profession of law and —See also courts ... 353
Ralli Brothers, Suggested boycott of ... 185
Ramnagar tragedy ... 98
Ranade, Gandhi and Justice 786
Ratanchand, the case of ... 82
Reason, Authority vs. 483, 668, 801
Reading, Interview of with Gandhi ... 604
" , Letter of Gandhi to ... 966
" , On racial equality in India 605, 614
" , On Ireland and India ... 621
" , Reply to speech of ... 605
" , Round Table Conference and... 918
" , Share of in repression ... 909
Reforms, Amritsar Congress and ... 823
" , Gandhi and Reforms in 1919 ... 823

Page

Reforms, Leaders on at Calcutta Congress 829
" , High cost of ... 434
" , No solution for economic problem ... 484
" , Revolution and ... 434
Religion and Patriotism, Gandhi on ... 584
" The true nature of ... 733
Representation in Congress—*See* Congress Constitution
" , Communal, 642, 1077
Repressive Laws Commission, Report of ... 618
Repression 901, 907, 1147
" in Indian States ... 1134
" Legislature debate on ... 952
" , The country under 939
" , Viceroy's share in ... 909
" , Hasrat Mohani on 881
Republic, Prospects of an Indian 879
Richard, M. Paul, on Tilak vs. Gandhi method ... 679
" , Reply of to Gandhi 683
Ridicule replacing Repression ... 572
" , To Repression from 573
Rights, attack on elementary —See also Freedom ... 971
" , Declaration of ...
Riza Ali on Suspension of Non-co-operation ... 590
" , Gandhi's reply to 914
Ronaldshay, Lord, on *Hind Swaraj* ... 884
Round table Conference Gandhi's demands at ... 929
Rowlatt Committee Report 19
" , Bills based on ... 13
Royal Proclamation ... 83

Page

S

Sankaran Nair, Sir, Withdrawal of from Malaviya Conference ... 921
Sapru, Dr., Reply to re: Pan-Islamism ... 724
Saraladevi Chaudharani, Message of to the Punjab 69
" and Mrs. O' Dwyer ... 88
Satyagraha, and Police punishment ... 28
" , and Violence ... 59
" , and strength of numbers ... 43
" , and hartal ... 43
" , and imprisonment ... 46
" , Committee 14, 17, 63
" , day and week 53,57, 654
" , Effects of Gandhi's statement on ... 15
" , Hope of India ... 6
" , Pledge ... 1159
" , Principles of ... 11
" , The secret of success of ... 171
" , Universality of 50
Satyagrahasram, Rules of ... 1172
Savarkar Brothers ... 94
Schools, Boycott of—See also National Education ... 337
" , Hallucination of 373
" , Degrading nature of 374
" , Boycott of, as moral education ... 375
" , as a lesson in self-reliance ... 376
" , Financial statistics re: ... 376
Schools, Boycott of, Dwijendranath Tagore on 377
Duty of students to boycott in spite of parents' wishes to the contrary... 382

Page

Financial consideration in 383
Necessary as moral surgery ... 377
Not necessarily loss of education ... 318
Reply to *Paravasi* re: ... 395
Reply to R. Tagore: ... 610
Scriptures, when in conflict with Reason ... 801
Secrecy, the sin of ... 1028
" , when to be respected ... 1137
Self-defence, Right of Non-co-operators to ... 1075
Sevres, Treaty of, ... 159
" , Revision Proposals re: ... 177
Shantiniketan, Satyagrahashram and ... 1137
Shraddhananda, Differences of Gandhi with ... 23
" , Non-violence and ... 283
Sikhs, Non-co-operation and 422
Simplicity, Need of for India 1090
Sitarm, M. L. C., Disillusionment re: Councils ... 348
Smith, Bosworth, Martiallaw atrocities of 117, 120 132
Social Boycott ... 297
" , a species of violence ... 297
" , a form of coercion ... 961
" , allegations against volunteers re: ... 300
" , Boycott of courts and ... 301
" , Councils and 298
" , Prohibition of does not mean permission of social intercourse ... 302
" , When justified 298, 1079
" , Zamindars and 951
Social ostracism, Reply to

Page

Mrs. Besant re: ... 302
Speech, Freedom of—See also Freedom ... 945
Spinning (hand), as a cottage industry to the Indian peasant ... 485
" , as training in organisation and co-operation 485, 543, 545
" , as distributing wealth and work 494
" , as insurance against pauper's death or the material aspect of 502, 505, 531, 546, 543, 587
as famine relief... 527
as test of discipline and sacrifice ... 507
" , Cheaper yarn prices result of ... 491
" , Capitalists and ... 495
" , Dignity of ... 591
Distinguished from sugar industry 505
Duty of students in, 516, 518, 535
Spinning (hand),
Economic progress and; 504, 517
Economics of ... 518
Easy and useful as domestic cooking ... 510
Handweaving vs. ... 532
How mills cannot solve problem of 490
Monotony in ... 536
Need for experts in 543
Not intended to replace wage-earning occupation ... 523
Not intended as a calling... 516
Non-co-operation and ... 506
Processes in ... 537
Reply to Rabindranath Tagore on 669
Reply to *Servant of India* 521

Page

Reply to the *Leader* ... 523
Sir P.C. Ray on 552
Saraladevi Chaudharani and ... 501
State of in pre-British days ... 587
Schools and colleges and... 486
Safeguards woman's honour or the moral aspect of 488, 543
Women and 485, 501
Essential to commence Civil Disobedience, political aspect of ... 544
Reply to Coubrough's views on ... 547
Sri Ram, Lala, Martial Law atrocities of ... 120
Stokes, S. E., Reply of Gandhi to ... 715
" , on Begar ... 743
Strikes, Labour,
Conditions for success in... 740
Easy susceptibility of Labour to ... 736
Hartals and ... 740
Maxims for leaders of ... 738
Possible abuse of 730, 732
Politics and ... 736
Sympathetic, conditions of success of ... 737
Students, Appeal to Bengal 391
" , Disobedience of parents in boycott of schools ... 382
" , Duty of co-operarating ... 393
" , Defence of against Tagore ... 459
Duty of to suspend studies and spin ... 515
" , Education Boycott and—See also Schools ... 375
" , Reasons against return to school of N. C. O. ... 390
" , Reply to Tagore on boycott by ... 610

Page

Students, Volunteering and 393
Suffering, the law of—See also Principles of Non-co-operation 230, 259, 281
" , Hate and ... 1114
Sundar Singh, Sadhu, on Gandhi's method ... 985
Swadesamitran Reply to on Non-co-operation ... 641
Swadeshi, Boycott contrasted with 147, 487
" , Constructive and prevents annual drain ... 488
, Evidence of success of ... 526
" , Government campaign against ... 1090
" , How to succeed in ... 489
" , How merchants cao help ... 514
" , Household fashions and 515, 516
, Khilafat and ... 507
" , Multiplication of mills no solution for—See also mills ... 486
" , Protection no substitute for ... 485
" , Reply to Coubrough on ... 547
" , Some "ifs" on... 541
" , Stores 507, 508, 511
Swadesi, the immediate problem—See also Spinning. Khaddar and boycott ... 484
" , Vow of 509, 1159
Swaraj, Bolshevism and ... 279
" , Change of Government not ... 793
, Conditions of 869, 870, ... 1089
" , Dwijendranath Tagore on ... 251
" , Definition of ... 653

Page

Swaraj, Elementary rights and ... 947
" , Freedom and ... 281
" , Fear of death and 898
" , Interview with the *Times* on 873
" , in one year 872
" , Jails under 1118, 1122
" , Mutual toleration necessary for ... 307
" , Meaning of ... 867
" , Non-co-operation and ... 249
" , Non-violence means for ... 293
" , Not Swaraj in *Hind Swaraj* ... 867
" , not antagonistic to modern civilisation 867
" , Nature of Congress .. 855
" , Success of Triple boycott a condition of ... 877
" , Police and punishments under ... 284
" , Spinning essential to 503
Sword, the Doctrine of the.. 257

T

Tagore, Dwijendranath on Non-co-operation vs, Co-operation ... 223
On the inner meaning of Non-co-operation ... 244
On moral values of Non-co-operation ... 251
On Non-co-operation in education ... 377
On ethics of destruction of foreign cloth ... 555
Tagore, Rabindranath, Message of re: Punjab ... 109
Gandhi's reply to on English education ... 459
on Non-co-operation 608, 668
Taylor, Dr., On Hindu... Muslim unity before British advent .. 401

Page

Taxes, Non-payment of, action of Government against ... 975
Taxes, Non-payment, of, Objections to as a form of Civil Disobedience ... 949
The last stage in Non-co-operation ... 951
Warning from Bengal re :... 981
Telegraph, if Government refuses the use of ... 1072
Temperance, Parsis and ... 430
" , Picketing and
" , –See picketing
Thana Municipality and picketing—See Municipality
Thoreau on Civil Disobedience ... 931
Tilak, Foreign propaganda and ... 791
" , Gandhi's tribute to ... 788
" , Kalelkar's reminiscences of ... 789
" , on Non-co-operation, 683, 785, 1071
" , on Non-violence vs. Freedom ... 679
" , On reforms at Amritsar Congress ... 824
" , P. Richard on Gandhi and 683, 783
" , the political method of 708
Times of India, Interview with on Swaraj ... 873
" , The, On the suspension of N. C. O. 591, 593
" , Reply to the Swaraj ... 867
Titles, renunciation of ... 337
" , Toleration, need for at meetings ... 307
Tolstoy, Gandhi's relation to ... 652
" , Letter to Liberals of ... 252
" , on Human nature 865

Page

Truth, personal variations and conscience ... 34
" Politics and ... 784
Turish question—See Khilafat ... 180
Tyabji Abbas, Effect of Non-co-operation on... 685
Tyranny of officials, how to be met (Painter's case) 1079

U

Untouchability a crime against humanity ... 482
" , Disappearance of in Gujarat ... 477
" , in Madras... 477
" , Removal of to precede Swaraj ... 470
" , the sin of—See also Depressed classes ... 469

V

Varnashramadharma—See also caste and Hinduism... 802
Vegetarianism, no part of Non-co-operation ... 410
Vernaculars, the use of—See also Hindustani ... 441
" , the Sadler Commission on ... 450
Vincent, Sir William, reply to on divide & rule ... 601
Violence, In case of outbreaks of ... 585
" , Non-co-operators and ... 991
" , vs. Non-violence...
" , See also Non-violence ... 255
" , Outbreaks of and Non-co-operation... 993
" , Religion and 282, 280

Page

Violence, When permissible 260, 1075
Volunteers, Demonstrations and ... 320
" , Lawyers as ... 1078
" , Laxity in recruitment of ... 1130
" , Rules for ... 1132
Voters, Boycott of elections and ... 343
" , Duty of—See also Councils ... 333
" , Instructions to re: boycott of Councils 343

W

Willoughby, the assassination of ... 265
Women, Begum Azad and Mrs. Stokes as model 768, 769
" , Conference with fallen women of Barisal and Andhradesa ... 751
" , Cloth picketing and 762
" , " , Conditions for success of ... 763
" , Dress of Tamil ... 757
" , Duty of ... 761
" , Fallen women of Lucknow and Cocanada ... 752
" , Islam and ... 750
" , Khaddar and 755, 759
" , Need for freedom of 749
" , Non-co-operation and ... 756
" , Ornaments and ... 750
Women, Statistics of fallen 754
" , The position of ... 748
" , Upliftment of fallen 750

Y

Yarn, Export of ...
" , Statistics of trade in—See also Spinning...

Page

Young India, Alleged contempt of court by ... 55
" , Objects of ... 2
" , removal of to Ahmedabad... 2
" , Prosecution of conductors of xxiii

Page

Young India, Why Government should not suppress... 1030

Z

Zacharias, Doubts of on Non-violence of Gandhi 1086
Zionism, the *Nation* on ... 179